

700. 9 2
3

A Short
INQUIRY
INTO THE
DOCTRINE
OF THE
TRINITY,

As it is laid down in H. SCRIPTURE.

Wherein the Errors of Dr. CLARKE,
Relating to that Subject, are Examin'd,
and Confuted.

Δοξάζω ἰησοῦ χριστὸν τὸ θεόν.

Ignat. Epist. ad Smyrn.

Nulla verecundia debet nos demovere a sententia dicenda, ubi de rebus divinis & humanis agitur.

By **GEORGE WADE, A. M.**
Late Fellow of *Christ's Colledge*; now Vicar
of *Ganesborough*, and Prebend of *Lincoln*.

L O N D O N:

Printed by H. P. for G. STRAHAN, at the
Golden-Ball, over against the *Royal Exchange*,
in *Coruhil*. MDCCLXXII.

7



w
int
w
ye

Sa
sch
Sc
ing
Do
lie
of
or



T H E
P R E F A C E.



S it ought to be the Endeavour of *Christians* in general, to know and understand the Grounds and Principles of their Religion; so it is the special Duty of *Those* who have Leisure and Abilities, to search into, and examine those *Articles of Faith*; which tho' they firmly believe *themselves*, yet they see most call'd in Question by *others*.

'T is for this Reason, and to give what Satisfaction I can to *others* as well as *my self*, that I have made the most impartial Scrutiny I can into the Sense and Meaning of the *Holy Scripture*, in relation to the *Doctrine of the Trinity*: A *Doctrine*! the Belief whereof as it seems to me, not to be of the smallest *Moment*, so is it, one way or other, made a Matter of the greatest

The Preface.

Controversy. I am not so vain as to think any thing I can say capable of putting an End to the Dispute; and a great deal less will satisfy my Expectation. May I only be so happy as to add any Light to an important Truth; to give any Strength to a Doubting Mind, or any Conviction to a Disbelieving one; and I shall then think my *Labours* very well rewarded, and look upon my *Mite* as bestowed to a very good Purpose.

I know not whether I should excuse myself for producing so few *Texts* of Scripture in Proof of the Articles I have undertaken to defend. I am apt to believe that nothing has given so great an Occasion of Triumph to our Adversaries of all Sorts as the Imprudence of those, who (as it seems by their Management) have had a greater Regard to the *Number*, than the *Strength* of their *Evidences*. A Method *Politick* enough! in Case the *Enemy* would be *scar'd*, and kept from *Fighting* by *Appearances*. But if once he ventures to *engage*, 'tis quite the *Contrary*. The *Weakness* of many gives him *Hopes* against *All*: And tho' it is an *Army* that opposes him; yet the *Conquests* he makes, persuade him, that it is but an *Army of Shadows*. Nay, what is worse, he shall not only by this Means be a *Victor* in his own, but oftentimes in another's Opinion: A *Looker-on* (if he is not the most Judicious,

The Preface.

cious) from the *Havock* he sees him make, and the *Numbers* of the *Slain* will not scruple to pronounce him an *absolute Conqueror*.

THIS was the true Reason why in drawing up this *Inquiry*, I insisted on so small a Number of *Texts* and *Topics* to prove our *Saviour's Divinity*, which as any one may easily see was the principal *Mark* I aim'd at. Not as if I thought there were no other it could be prov'd by, but because these made the strongest Impression upon me; and on that Account seem'd capable of being managed by me to the best Advantage.

'TIS for the same Reason that I have been careful not to raise any Argument on those *Texts* which are so much call'd in *Question* either for their *Lection*, *Punctuation*, or *Legitimacy*; particularly that famous one, 1 John. 5. 7. I am far from betraying the least Tittle of any thing to our *Enemies*, that may be urged in *Defence* of the received *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*. But I would fain let them see, that the *Article* we teach, can easily be supported without these suspected *Witnesses*. I would show them, that we have no *Occasion* for such *Evidences*, and rob them of that malicious *Suggestion*, " That the *Trinitarians* would " not so much insist on the dubious *Texts*, could
" the

The Preface.

*“ the Doctrines they hold be maintain’d with-
“ out them.*

LET me farther observe, that tho’ in the following *Inquiry* I have by no Means neglected the *SOCINIAN*; yet the *ARIAN* is he that has most engaged my Notice. Whatever the other *has been*, or *may be* again, this *now* is the *Man of Fashion* amongst us, and seems to strut with a greater *Air of Vanity*, having got the *Learned* and *Ingenious Dr. Clarke* for his *Companion*. ’Tis the great and universal *Character*, which this *Gentleman* deservedly has amongst the *learned World*, that gives *Credit* and *Countenance* to a *Cause*, which wants indeed, but is very *unworthy* of such a *Patron*. He certainly has *defended* it the best of all our *Moderns*. His *Scripture Doctrine*, and the *Defences* of it, are *Pieces* that show a great deal both of *Art*, and *Learning*; but yet abound with a great many *Faults* too much *unbecoming* his *Parts* and *Profession*.

THE 1st thing I have to *accuse* him of, is, That he *wanders*, wilfully and designedly *wanders*, from the *Subject* he professes to *treat* of. His first celebrated *Piece* upon the *Trinity* he calls *The Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity*. And from such a *Title* who would expect to find any other *Doctrine* than that of the *Scripture* it self alone? When behold!

The Preface.

behold ! The venerable *Fathers* * are suddenly *cited*, and their *Testimonies* so largely insisted on, that they serve to make up a great Part of his *Book*. And is not this a plain and palpable *Deviation*? Is not this having Recourse to another *Doctrine* besides that of the *Scripture*? The *Doctor* indeed

* *The same may be observ'd of the Liturgy which (for the sake of Illustration too) the Dr. has stray'd into. This (because forsooth it addresses it self to Christ in the Quality of Mediator) he will have to favour his Doctrine in every Branch of it ; but at the same time has the Modesty to own, that there are some Passages in it, which may seem in some Respect to differ from it. But do they only Seem then? And no more than barely Differ? Consider but the two following Instances produced by himself—Who livest and reignest with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, ever One GOD World without End. Coll. 3d Sund. Adv. And—Who art—not one only Person, but Three Persons in One Substance: For that which we believe of the Glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and the Holy Ghost, without any Difference or Inequality. Prop. Præf. Trin. Sun. Let the Dr. reconcile these, and the like Passages to his Notions, if he can; and if he cannot, give me Leave to remark, that a Man who takes such Liberty in misrepresenting the Liturgy; which almost every one has read, will not scruple to do the same with the Fathers, whose Writings the greatest Part of the World are intirely Strangers to.*

tells

The Preface.

tells us, That the *Testimonies* * he has produced from the *Fathers*, are not *alleged* by him as *Proofs* of any of his *Propositions*, but as *Illustrations* only. But let them be what they will, 'tis plain from his *Title-Page*, he had *nothing* to do with *them*. His *Business* was to *stick close* to the *Doctrine* of the *Scripture*, and that *only*, and not, in *Contradiction* to the *First Thing* he has said, to trouble himself and others (impertinently enough) with the *Doctrine of Men*. We should scarce look upon him as a *faithful Guide*, who after he had *undertook* to *conduct* us to such or such a *Place* by the *King's Highway*, should, as often as he pleas'd, *turn aside* into the *private Roads*, with the *Pretence* of giving us a *better View* of the *Country*. In a Word, The *Citations* which *Dr. Clarke* has brought from the *Fathers*, as they are a flat *Contradiction* to the *Subject* of his *Book*, so must they be *productive* of very *bad Effects*. They have not only a strong *Tendency* to *prepossess* some People in *Favour* of his *Notions*, but likewise to throw a great many *Doubts* and *Scruples* into the *Minds* of others, which they cannot so easily *satisfy*. Every *Body* has an *Opportunity* of *reading* the *Scripture*; but *few* of *consulting* the *Fathers*: And therefore since

* *Introduct.* p. 20.

The Preface.

the *Latter* are not produced as *Evidence* themselves, why should they (thro' pretence of *Illustration*) be brought to confound that which is so? But

2dly, I do not only find fault with *Dr. Clarke* for Citing the *Fathers*, but for Citing them in the *Manner* that he has done. He does not (because he dares not) appeal to their *Authority*; but quotes them only with a *Design* to show, That, † in spite of their *Prejudices*, they were sometimes forc'd to yield to that *Evidence of Truth* which appears on his *Side*: And to prove this, with a great deal of *Difficulty*, has laid hold of some few *Passages*, which he takes to *Favour* his *Notions* and *Opinions*. A *Method* by which any *Author* may be easily made to *Confute* himself; and by which I will venture to prove, that *Dr. Clarke* is an *Orthodox Trinitarian*. In one Part * of his *Writings*, I remember he has told us, "That *Christ* is by Nature truly *God*; (as truly, as *Man* is by Nature truly *Man*.)" which, I think, is as much as to say, that he is *naturally* and *essentially* *God*. And if any should say that the *Evidence of Truth* extorted this from him, and that the *Notion* was so easy and natural, that he could

† Vide *Introduc. to Scrip. Doc.* p. 20.

* *Reply to Mr. Nelson*, p. 81.

The Preface.

not forbear expressing it so clearly and distinctly, even when at the Same time he was about to affirm, and endeavour to prove some things not very consistent with it; they would not, I think, do greater *Injustice* to the *Doctor*, than he has done to the *Fathers*. He may tell them indeed, that they should not take *this*, without taking too *what follows*. But this is a *Plea* that may easily be retorted: And if I might advise, the *Doctor*, for his own sake, should not too much *insist* upon it. But

3dly, As *Dr. Clarke* has by no means dealt fairly by the *Fathers*; so neither has he been exact enough in his *Examination* of the *inspired Writers*.

HIS 1st Endeavour is to prove, that the *Father* is stiled the *one God*, *God absolutely*, and by way of *Eminence*, *God with peculiar high Epithets*, and who is also the *ultimate Object* of our *Prayers and Praises*. The *Proof* of this (being a Point so very much doubted of) takes up 70 *Pages*. And after all, may we not have leave to ask *one Question*? Is the Term, *Father*, as it is applied to the *Godhead*, always used in the same *Sense* in the *New Testament*? Does it always include the *whole Deity*? And is it never restrained to a narrower *Signification*? How is it, for Instance, to be understood *Mat.*

The Preface.

28. 19. *Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?* Is the Father, in this place, put for the whole Godhead, exclusive of the Son, and the Holy Ghost? Or only for One Person in the Deity, who with the Son, and the Holy Ghost is One God, in One and the same Essence? The Doctor ought either to Prove, that the Term is always used in the same Sense; or, if it is not, should Distinguish to us in what Sense it is taken. But at present he has done neither of these; and therefore has by no means performed the Part of a judicious Examiner.

Well! but in the next Step he goes farther, and shews us, that this Father is Superior to the Son; or, as he expresses it, that the Son Is and Acts subordinate to the Father. And what then? Why then, I warrant, he is not Supreme God. A Consequence which by no means follows from the Doctor's premises! The most Orthodox Divines have allowed, that as far as Christ is a Son; so far he is Inferior to the Father. But then, as he partakes with the Father of the Divine Essence, and is One with Him in Substance, so far he is equal to the Father, and is God Supreme.

I would farther observe, that as Christ is a Son in two Respects, 1st in his Divine; and 2^{dly} in his Human Nature, had the Dr. been exact enough, he would have rang'd

The Preface.

the *Texts*, relating to each of these, under their distinct Heads, and not jumbled them together in the *confus'd* manner he has done. What Occasion to quote at Length such a multitude of *Texts*, to prove that the Son in his Human Nature *Is* and *ACTs* subordinate to the Father, i. e. that Man is inferior to God? But these are *Arts*, that are necessary to impose upon the ignorant and injudicious; and therefore must be made use of:

THESE are Defects, which deserve every Body's Notice: And besides these, I could point out a great many more, particularly in his Citations; one Instance whereof I will not scruple to give, even from the Scripture it self. In the 124th Page of his Reply to the Objections of Mr. Nelson, in order to answer some Texts that are urged against him, he explains them from this Notion, That Representatives very often speak in the Name and Person of those they Represent; and endeavours to Illustrate this from what St. Stephen says, Acts 7. 30. which he quotes thus (*viz.*) The Angel of the Lord appeared to Moses in a Flame of Fire in the Bush, — saying, I am the God of thy Fathers. Who said so? Why certainly the Angel, according to Dr. Clarke, and this Angel not God, but only a Representative of God. And yet neither of these is so certain, if we do but consult our Bibles.

There

The Preface.

There appeared unto him, says St. Stephen, in the Wilderness of Mount Sina an Angel of the Lord in a Flame of Fire in a Bush. When Moses saw it, he wondered at the Sight, and as he drew near to behold, THE VOICE OF THE LORD came unto him, saying, I am the God of thy Fathers. And was it now the Angel, or the Lord, who said, I am the God of thy Fathers? Supposing him that appear'd, and him who spake, to be different Persons, 'tis plain that it was not the Angel, who said so: And supposing them to be the same Person, 'tis evident that the Angel was $\delta\ \omega\pi\iota\sigma\tau\eta$, Jehovah himself; and therefore did not speak in the Name and Person of another, but properly in his own. Let the Dr. therefore take it which way he will, he ought not to have suppress'd the Voice of the Lord: And let me tell his Admirers, that such Citations as this, if they proceed from Negligence, are very blameworthy; if from Design, they are almost unpardonable.

Let me farther remark, that the like Inaccuracy may easily be observed in the Dr's Translations too; of which let the following Passage from Tertullian, in the 90th Page of his *Scripture Doctrine*, be a Testimony, *Unum sumus, dicens, Ego, & Pater, ostendit Duos esse, quos ÆQUAT, & jungit.* Which exactly translated runs thus, *When he says,*
I,

The Preface.

I, and my Father, are one, *he shows they are two Persons, whom he EQUALS and joins together.* But how does the Dr. render it? Why, the Word *ÆQUAT*, it seems, would by no Means go down; and therefore the Doctor in his *Construction* of it, changes it into an *Adverb*, and, with the *Addition* of *SO*, gives it us thus: *He shows they are Two Persons, whom he SO joins equally together.* What poor Shifts are these, when *Grammar* it self is *perverted* and *abused* to favour a Cause, which without such *Arts*, and even *with* them, 'tis impossible to support!

NOR is this the *only* Instance of this Sort. I could easily produce *Numbers* of the like; but at present shall satisfy my self in giving only one more, which is to be met with in the 73d Page of the *Scripture-Doctrine*. The Doctor is there endeavouring to show, how the *Logos* is *God*, in his Sense, and tells us from *Origen*, that he was, μετοχὴ τῆς αὐτοῦ θεότητος θεοποιῶντος; *God* (says Dr. Clarke) by *Communication of Divinity from Him, who is of himself God.* Admirably well done! But where is the *FROM*, which gives intirely a *new Turn* to the Sentence. *Origen* has no such Thing, his Words being *literally* these: *God by Participation of the Deity of the self-existing God.* And from hence I argue, that

The Preface.

that it was not an *inferior* Sort of *God-head*; which the *Logos* had. It was, according to *Origen*, the *Deity of the self-existing God*; and as that *Deity* is *supreme*, he who has it, must necessarily be *supreme God*. But this is too *clear*. And therefore it must be *Divinity*, not *OF*, but *FROM him*, who is of himself *God*; that is, in *Dr. Clarke's* Sense, *Dominion* and *Authority* only, as if the θεότης Ἀυτοῦ was no more than *That*.

THESE are Reflections which naturally occur'd to me in reading what *Dr. Clarke* has writ upon the *Trinity*. What follows, perhaps, he may not think to affect *him*, because it does not give a *VIEW* of *ALL* the *Texts* of the *New Testament*, that relate to the *Subject*; and nothing less, it * seems, can possibly touch him. But let him think as he pleases, he may possibly find *others* of a different Opinion: And if I can show but *one single Text* that is *inconsistent* with his *Scheme*, even that *single one* will demonstrate, that his *Doctrine* is *false*, and wants what he *despises*, to support it. But I hope to produce more than *one* of this Sort; and if these *few Sheets* should meet with *Encouragement*, I design, if *Providence* gives me *Life* and *Leisure*, to be *more particular*

* *Vide* Preface to *Scrip. Doctr.*

The Preface.

in examining the Texts of *Scripture* that relate to the *Trinity*, than even Dr. Clarke himself has been.

To prevent Mistakes, I am obliged to repeat, that as often as in the following *Inquiry*, I say our *Saviour* is *God* *supreme*, or *God* in the highest Sense, I mean no more than that He is *consubstantial* with the *Father*. As to the *Order*, and *Priority* of the *Persons* in the *Trinity*, I leave that as I find it in the *Form* of *Baptism*.



A Short



A Short
INQUIRY
Into the *DOCTRINE*
Of the
TRINITY.



HAVE already intimated, that, in the Course of this *Inquiry*, I intend to make the *Scripture* my *only Guide*, without *Appealing* to the *Authority* either of *Fathers*, or of *Councils* (tho' I have the greatest *Veneration* for both); and, to avoid any farther *Preface*, the

FIRST Thing which the *Scripture* teaches me, in reference to the *Doctrine* I am going
B upon,

upon, is, That 'tis absolutely and indispensably *necessary* for every *Christian* to believe in a *Trinity*, that is, in *Three Some-whats*, which the *Scripture* expresses to us, under the *Three Names* of *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*. If any *Sense*, any *Conclusion* can be drawn from the plainest Words; *this* certainly may from our *Savior's* Commission to his *Apostles*, *Go, Disciple all Nations, Baptizing them into the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost*: Which is just as if he had said, By the *Seal*, and *Sacrament* of *Baptism*, make them *Disciples* of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, and ready and willing to be called and distinguished by that *Name*. From whence we may fairly conclude, that except we are the *Disciples* and *Professors* of these *Three*, we have not so much as a *Right*, to be called *Christians*; much less can we be intitled to the *Privileges* of *Christianity*.

'Tis plain then, how *necessary* it is for every *Christian* to *Believe* in a *Trinity*: And as this is *necessary*, so in the

SECOND place, is it highly *reasonable*, that every *Man*, whether he already *is*, or designs to be a *Christian*, should *inquire* what is meant by it, and what he is to *understand* by that *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*, which, as a *Christian*, he is bound to *believe* in. And here, for the

FIRST

FIRST of these *three* Terms, we need not go about to *prove* what no body *denies*. That *the Father* is really and truly God, is agreed on all Hands: But how he is so, is the *Question* to be resolved. 'Tis vehemently asserted by the *Arians* and *Soci-nians*, on *one side*, that to this Father *alone* is to be ascribed a *real*, and *absolute*, and *supreme Divinity*: And as constantly maintain'd by the *Trinitarians*, on *the other*; that, as there are *three Distinctions*, or *Relations* in the Deity, so *the Father* here is put *only* for *one of them*: And *which* of these contending *Parties* the *Truth* belongs to, will be best seen by the *Discussion* of the *two remaining Articles*. For if *the Son*, and *the Holy Ghost*, are *not* described in *Scripture* as *equal* in *Nature*, to *the Father*, then 'tis plain the *former* are in the right; But if it appears, on the contrary, that *each* of *these* is spoke of as *God*, in the *same Sense* that *the Father* is; then 'tis as plain, that an impartial Judgment must declare for the *latter*. Let us then examin the *Nature* of *both* these: And as the *Son* stands *first* in *Order*, so let it have the *first Place* in our *Consideration*.

NOW the very same *Person* whom *St. John* describes under the *Character* of the *Logos*, taking *Flesh* upon him, *St. Mathew* here calls *the Son*, plainly in *Relation* to the Term *Father*, which immediately goes be-

fore it; and this, to signify to us, that we are to believe in *Jesus Christ*, the *Messiah*, who was *the Son of God*; not by *Adoption*, *Creation*, or otherwise, as *we* are; but after a *singular* and *extraordinary Manner*, as he was *really* and *truly begotten* by the *Father*; and for that reason in *many Places* of *Scripture* is *eminently stiled the Son of God*.

THUS far 'tis plain, *who* is the *Person* intended by the *Son*. But is there nothing farther to be *inquired*? Might not an *Heathen*, or a *Jew*, whom we design'd to make a *Convert* to *Christianity*, very reasonably ask, *What* is this *Son of God*? Is he *God*? or *Man*? or *both*? or *neither*? No reasonable *Creature* will be so far imposed on, as to profess his *Belief* in a *mere Name*, without knowing the *Nature* it belongs to. Let us see therefore, what the *Scripture* says in reference to these *Questions*: They are far from being *impertinent*, and certainly *deserve* the plainest *Answers* that can be given them.

FIRST then, 'tis plain from several *Passages* of *Holy Writ*, that our *Savior Jesus Christ*, the *Son of God*, was *really* and *truly Man*, consisting of *Soul* and *Body*, the *same* with *ours* in *Nature*, and *differing* in *nothing*, but their being *pure* from *Sin*. *St. Luke* tells us, that * *he increas'd in Wisdom*,

as

* Luke 2. 52.

as to his Soul; and *in Nature*, as to his Body, just as *other Men* do. And if *Christ* himself may be supposed to have understood his own *Nature*, there is no one *Appellation* he so frequently gives himself as that of *the Son of Man*; thereby plainly intimating, that he *really* was, what the *Author* of the *Hebrews* asserts him to have been, † *in all things like unto his Brethren*, and of the same *Nature* with the *ordinary* Sons of Men. But,

SECONDLY, As the History of the B. *Jesus* informs us, that he was *perfect Man*; so does it likewise tell us, that he was *perfect God*; *God supreme*; *God the same in Nature and Essence* with the *Father*. And that it does so, is evident, if we consider,

First, *What our Savior said and did himself*; and

Secondly, *What is attested of him, by the Mouth of his Apostles*.

FIRST then, *From what our Savior said and did himself*; 'tis evident, that he was *God supreme*. And for the Truth of

† Heb. 2. 17.

this, I appeal to that famous Passage, where he tells the Paralytic * Man, *Thy Sins be forgiven thee* ; which we are to understand, not (as some would have us) that our Savior only declares to the Man, what was revealed to him by God, but positively, and directly by his own inherent Power, absolv'd him from his Sins. Which is plain,

1. From his Manner of speaking to him, *Thy Sins BE† forgiven thee*, not *Are forgiven thee* ; which is a manifest Error, not only in ours, but in most Versions; tho', to do our Translators Justice, they have taken Care to correct it in the 23d Verse. But let Christ himself determine this for us: *Whether*, says he, *is easier to say* (as I have just now done) ἀφεωνται σοι αι αμαρτιαι ; or εγεραι, & σταντα. Which plainly shews, the two Phrases being set in Opposition to each other; that the former was spoken in an imperative, commanding Manner as well as the latter.

* Luke 5. 20.

† Αφεωνται pro αφωνται, 3tia persona plurali, modi Conjunct. ut αφεν pro αφη, Iliad. π. 590. Vid. Bezae Annotat. in Marc. 2. 5. Recte igitur nova illa, & accurata, quam in emendatiss. R. Stephani Biblii, Lutetiae A. D. 1545 impressis habemus Translatio, Remittantur.

2. From

2. From the *Answer*, which *Christ* returns to the Charge of *Blasphemy*, that the *Jews* brought against him. *This Man*, say they, *blasphemeth*. Why? Because he arrogates to himself, what is God's *Prerogative*: For *who can forgive Sins, but God only*? Which, by the way, clearly shews, with what *Authority* *Christ* had spoken, and confirms my former *Observation*, that in *Ab-solving* the *Paralytic* he express'd himself in Terms as *absolute*, as *God himself* could be supposed to do. But what *Reply* does our Savior make to this *Accusation*? Why, such an one, as is sufficient to convince us, that he did not deliver his *Absolution* in a *declarative manner*, or by way of *Commission* only. For then the *Answer* was easy: Your Reasonings in this Case are certainly just, that *none* but *God* can forgive Sins, *absolute-ly*, and by his own *proper Power*; and therefore I agree with you, that *whoever*, besides *God* himself, pretends to *forgive* them in *this way*, he is certainly guilty of *Blas-phemy*. But for *my self*, I have done no such Thing: I have not *pardon'd* this Man by *my own*, but by *God's Authority*: I act only as his *Minister* and *Delegate*; and as *such* have *declared* what he was pleas'd to reveal to me. This, or something like this, as it must have been *satisfactory* to the *Jews*; so would it have been extremely *natural*, and even *necessary* in this Case. For he saw
that

that the *Jews* understood him in an *absolute Sense* of *Forgiving*; and for him to use it in *another Sense*, without giving them notice of it, especially, where there appears no Reason for concealing it, but just the contrary, was no better than amusing them with Words, and vindicating himself by an *Equivocation*. But instead of this, without once making *Mention* of God, or once acquainting the *Jews*, that he had spoken as his *Deputy*, he goes on, to vindicate what he had done in the most *Divine* and *God-like* manner imaginable. *Whether*, says he, *is easier?* to say, *Thy Sins be forgiven thee?* or to say, *Rise up, and walk?* As much as to say, *How shall I convince you, that I have not blasphemed God, in forgiving this Man his Sins?* What *Proof* shall I give, that I have strictly and properly a *Right* to *forgive Sins?* Will you believe, that I can *pardon* without *Blasphemy*, on Condition I show my self *Omnipotent?* And what clearer Instance can I give of an *Almighty Power*, than by my *Fiat*, merely by a *Word*, to make this Man *Rise*, and *Walk?* That therefore you may know I have this *Power*, and by consequence, a *Right* to *Forgive Sins*, I will only say unto him, *Arise, take up thy Couch, and go into thine House;* and it shall be according to my *Word*.

'T IS plain then, both from our Saviour's Manner of speaking to the Paralytic, and his Answer to the Jews, that he forgave Sins by his own inherent Authority: And what St. Matthew adds, that * when the Multitude saw it, they marvelled, and glorified God, who had given such Power unto Men, is no Objection to it; much less will it effectually silence us, as a certain Author † is pleased to imagine. The Jews thought that Christ forgave Sins, as a Man, because he appear'd to them to be no more than such; and therefore he did forgive them merely as Man. An admirable Conclusion! Why do not these People prove, that our Saviour was mad, or possess'd with a Devil, since 'tis plain, that some of the Jews had such an Opinion of him?

FOR my part, I cannot help thinking, that an Observation full as pertinent, and a great deal more exact, may be drawn from this very Passage: And that is, that from the Beginning to the End of this Story, our Saviour had not given the Jews the least Hint of his Forgiving the Man in a ministerial way. For otherwise, why should they be struck with so great Won-

* Mat. ix. 8. † Dr. Bennet *Disc. Trin.* p. 103.

*der and Surprise at what he had done? Why should they magnify his Power, as new * and unheard of? Nay stupendous, and † incredible? Where is the Paradox of Christ's being authorized by God to forgive the Man his Sins? There was nothing so mighty strange in this: The Prophet Nathan had done § the very same Thing to David; and I see nothing in it that sets it above the Level of an ordinary Revelation.*

FROM the whole 'tis evident to me, that our Saviour forgave the Paralytic his Sins, not in a Subordinate, but Sovereign Manner, not by Another's, but by his own original Power and Authority. And from hence what can be the Inference but this, that he was the supreme God of Heaven and Earth? I say, the supreme God: For otherwise, he could not Forgive Sins, in that way, which, I have shew'd, he did; except we suppose that the supreme God can communicate his Supremacy to a Being different from Himself; which is direct Nonsense, and a Contradiction in Terms; since at this rate, God is Supreme, and not Supreme, at the same time. 'Tis ridiculous to imagine, that those Sins, which are

* Mark ii. 12.
παράδοξα.

† Luke v. 26. ἐδόκει
§ 2 Sam. xii. 13.

committed against God, can properly be pardoned by any but God himself.

BUT we must not yet leave this noble Piece of *History*; but must farther observe, that our *B. Lord* does not only take to himself the *supreme Royalty of Heaven*, in issuing out his *Pardons*, but vindicates his Claim to it by a *Miracle*, which he purposely exerts, to show himself *Omnipotent*.
 “Ye think, says he, that none but God
 “can forgive Sins, and that ’tis no less
 “Easy to DO this, than it is to BE Al-
 “mighty. I will show you then, that I
 “can DO the former, by proving my self
 “to BE the latter; and in order to this,
 “I command this impotent Man to be in-
 “stantly and immediately whole.” I
 need not observe, that this *Argument* is not so much founded on the *Miracle* it self, as on the *End and Design* of it: The intent of it was to demonstrate his *Omnipotence*, and by consequence, that He was GOD; and therefore that he could forgive Sins: So that in this short Passage we have Two undeniable Evidences of Christ’s *supreme Divinity*. In absolving a Sinner, he puts on the *incommunicable Majesty* of Heaven; and in Sealing his Pardon with a *Miracle*, he demonstrates to us, that he had a Right to what he had done, which he had evinced by as clear an Evidence, as *Almighty Power* it self was able to produce in the like Case.

LET this stand for one Argument of Christ's being GOD in the highest Sense.

2. THE next I shall offer is taken from those *Titles* and *Characters*, which Christ lays Claim to, and are Due to none but the *supreme* GOD himself. Hear how he speaks of himself to his Disciples in the 23^d Chapter of *St. Matthew*. Be * not ye called Rabbi; for ONE is your Master even Christ. And presently † after, Be not ye called Guides: for ONE is your Guide, even Christ. But how could our Saviour thus limit and restrain these Titles to himself, if he was no more than a subordinate Teacher? How could he, if he was not the ONE GOD, require his Disciples to acknowledge him for their One Guide and Master? Especially if we consider, what he himself adds immediately after. But ¶ who, says he to his Disciples, is greatest among you, let him be your Servant: For who-soever exalteth himself shall be abased, and he that humbleth himself shall be exalted. Now supposing that our Saviour was not God in the highest Sense, might not this Doctrine have been retorted upon himself? Might not the Disciples have ask'd him, why he (tho' never so great) exalted him-

* v. 8.

† v. 10.

¶ v. 11.

self to such a *Degree* as he had just now done? Why instead of stiling himself the *ONE Master*, he had not rather declined that *lofty Title*, and hereby given them an *Example* of that *Humility* which he had so much recommended to their *Practice*? 'Tis evident they might: Our *Saviour* had manifestly *weakened* his own *Doctrine*, had he been *less* than God *supreme*, and therefore we must conclude, that he was *that very Being*.

To this perhaps it may be objected, that tho' *Christ* calls himself the *ONE Master*, yet he has sufficiently distinguished himself from the *most high* God, as he has reserved for him the *Title* of the *One* * *Father*, and commanded his *Disciples* to call none else by that Name.

BUT this is so far from *weakening* what I have laid down, that it certainly *strengthens* it. For do but observe the *Argument* which this leads us to. *Christ* says, that

* πατήρ, the *Title* by which the senior *Rabbies* were saluted amongst the *Jews*. And so Lud. de Dieu in *Animad.* in *Act.* 22. 3. speaking of the *Rabbies* and their *Scholars*, says, *Discipulus non vocabatur nisi nomine Patris, ex. gr. Filius Simeonis. Et post Impositionem manuum, quâ ad Rabbinitum promovebatur, suo Nomine appellabatur. Rabbi David, Filius Simeonis. To this Custom the word πατήρ here relates.*

God *alone* is the *One Father*, that is, the *ONE Teacher*, or *Master*. (For in this Sense the Word *Father* must be taken in this Place.) But Christ tells us in the next Verse, that he *himself* is this *ONE Master*, or *Father*; and therefore from hence it directly follows, that Christ was *really* and *truly* God.

'Tis in vain to tell us, that the *Title of Father* is *superior* to that of *Master*, and that therefore Christ speaks of himself as *inferior* to God. 'Tis plain (as I have already observ'd) that the *One Father* is no more, than the *most excellent Master*, and the *One Master* signifies just the same.

I own indeed, that amongst the *Jews*, the *Title of Father* was given even by the *Rabbins* themselves to their *Superiors*. But where there is but *One Rabbi*, he must be *the One Father*, there being no room left for *Superiority*; and therefore as *Christ* is this *One Rabbi*, 'tis evident, even to *Demonstration*, that he has no *Superior*.

I might now proceed to confirm the same Truth I have been pleading for, from that *arbitrary and independent* Manner, in which the Gospel tells us, our Saviour perform'd the greatest Part of his *Miracles*. But this has been so *largely*, and *judiciously* treated of by another Hand, that I think it needless to pursue that Argument farther.

So much then for *what our Saviour said and did himself*. Let us now see in the

Second Place, *What is attested of Him by the Mouth of his Apostles.*

Now the 1st Evidence of this sort, is that of the *Angel*, recorded by *St. Luke* in the * 1st Chapter of his Gospel: *Many shall He [John the Baptist] turn to the Lord their God, and he shall go before Him in the Spirit and Power of Elias.*

HERE it is plain, that whoever is the Person designed by the Word *HIM*, he it is, that in the preceding Verse is stiled the *LORD THEIR GOD*: But 'tis allow'd by all, † that our Saviour is designed by it; and therefore *He* it is, that by the *Angel* is stiled the *Lord their God*.

FOR an Answer to this *Dr. Clarke* ¶ is pleas'd to send us to a Passage in the § 1st Epist. of *St. John*: *Ye know that HE was manifested to take away our Sins; and in HIM is no Sin*. Where, says the Doctor, the Words *HE* and *HIM* must of necessity be referr'd to Christ, tho' without any antecedent mention of him, the Father only having

* v. 16, 17. † See *Dr. Cl. Ser. Doct.* p. 72.
 ¶ *Ser. Doc.* p. 74. § iii. 5.

been before spoken of, in the 1st Verse. But where is *Learning*? Where is *Ingenuity*? Is it possible for Dr. CLARKE to speak and write in such a manner as this? Is not there an antecedent mention of the Son in the 24th v. of the 2d Chapter? And does not every thing that follows relate to Him, as plainly as can be? Yes: But from the 1st v. of the 3d Chapter, there is no express mention of any Person but the Father? But is not this ridiculous? Did St. John divide his Epistle into Chapters? And if he did not, is any Stress to be laid upon this? Such things as these are beneath Dr. Clarke: If he is pleas'd to consider this a second time, he will soon see, that this Passage in St. John, and that I have cited from St. Luke are as unlike as can be. In St. John the Word HIM has an Antecedent, tho' it is placed at some Distance from it: In St. Luke it has none, if the Lord God is not allow'd to be so. For there is no mention before made of Christ from the Beginning of the History.

WELL! but if this Twig fails him, the Doctor has another to lay hold on. For what, tho' it must be granted, that Christ is here called *The Lord God*; yet this only in a subordinate Sense, as he has this Title, by Communication of the Father's Power and Dominion. What! when he himself says,

says, * *that the Title of LORD GOD in the Stile of St. Luke, and according to the whole Analogy of Scripture, cannot but signify the Father, or which, in his own Sense, is all one, God supreme.* 'Tis something mighty odd, that a Title which, by his own Confession, is restrained to a Being supreme, should be given to another subordinate.

THIS last is a Testimony of our Saviour's supreme God-head, before his Incarnation.

2. THE next that follows is one that was given after his Resurrection; I mean St. Thomas's Confession: A Confession, which sure, if Prejudice were set aside, would give every one as full Conviction of Christ's supreme Divinity, as He, when he made it, had of his Resurrection. Thomas † answered, and said unto him, My Lord, and my God. He does not say, by way of Admiration, My Lord, and my God! But he says to him, he confesses to JESUS, that He was his Lord and his God: Titles, which, if we well consider, and from whom they came, not from an Heathen, but a Jew, who neither knew nor dared to acknowledge any God but One, we must allow, that the Person they were given to

* Ser. Doc. p. 72.

D

† John.

was

was God supreme. Let him, as Bishop Pearson says, be the Lord, and God of me, and of every true Christian, who was the Lord and God of an Apostle.

THE 3^d Testimony I shall produce is that of St. John, who, in the very Beginning of his Gospel, tells us in Words the most exprels that can be, that the *Word*, before it became *Flesh* in the *Person* of the B. Jesus, was no other than God most High. In the Beginning, says he, was the *Word*, and the *Word* was with God, and God was the *Word*. Let the *Arians*, and *Socinians* now join their *Forces*, and see whether they can make a subordinate, or nominal God of this. I own indeed, that I have given the Words in a different Order from what we meet with in our common Translations. But that it is the true Construction of them will evidently appear.

1st. From the *Stile* of St. John, which, all along, is Plain and Easy, and the most Abhorrent of * Transpositions that can be.

* I doubt not but πνεῦμα ὁ θεός (John 4. 24.) will be made an Objection to this; and would be much stronger, if our Translation was right, God is a Spirit: For then there would be a manifest Transposition. But I think there is full as as Good, or Better, reason to translate it, A Spirit is God; just as

Tully

This is so well known to every one that can read *Greek*, that I need not be at the Pains to prove it: So that according to this *Rule*, θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος, must necessarily be construed, *God was the Word*, and not, *the Word was God*. The former is the natural Order of the Words, and cannot be disturb'd without doing *Violence* to the *Evangelist*. But

2dly, As this is plain from *St. John's Way of writing*, in general, so is it still

Tully says, *The Sun, or the Heaven, or the Æther is God*. 'Tis certain that the *Vulgar, the Syriac, and Æthiopic Versions*, all of them have it so; and the *Article*, being prefix'd to θεός, and not to πνεῦμα, will never be able to turn the Scale against them. It might be made a *Question*, whether it ought not to be read, πνεῦμα, ὁ θεός. It is a *Spirit*, which is *God*. But allowing the common ὁ, I say, that the word πνεῦμα wanting an *Article*, and θεός having one, is no *Proof* that the latter is the *Subject* of the *Proposition*, and the former the *Predicate*. For the very *Nature* of the *Greek Language* would by no means suffer that πνεῦμα here should have an *Article*: Τὸ πνεῦμα, θεός, is plainly, *The Spirit is God*, which in this Place would be intolerably absurd. The *Evangelist* therefore with good *Reason* omits it here, and (to confute the *Errors* of the *Samaritans*, who worshiped *God* under a corporeal Resemblance) writes thus, πνεῦμα ὁ θεός, *A Spirit is the true God*.

plainer from that particular Method, which he observes in the *first Verses* of his Gospel; where we may all along observe, that the *Conclusion* of one Proposition is made the *Beginning* of the next. Thus in the 4th and 5th Verses: 'ΕΝ ΑΥΤῳ ΖΩΗ ἦν, καὶ ἡ ΖΩΗ ἦν τὸ ΦΩΣ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τὸ ΦΩΣ ἐν τῇ ΣΚΟΤΙΑ φαίνει, καὶ ἡ ΣΚΟΤΙΑ αὐτὸ ἐκάλειλεν. In him was LIFE, and this LIFE was the LIGHT of Men, and the LIGHT shineth in DARKNESS, and the DARKNESS comprehended it not. And so in the *first Verse*; 'Εν ἀρχῇ ἦν ὁ ΛΟΓΟΣ, καὶ ὁ ΛΟΓΟΣ ἦν πρὸς τὸν ΘΕΟΝ, καὶ ΘΕΟΣ ἦν ὁ Λόγος: In the Beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and (need I ask whether it ought not to be follow'd?) God was the Word.

To confirm these Arguments, let me add in the

3d Place, that the most, or at least the most ancient, and most approved Translators, have given the Words in the same Order that I have done. Witness the *antient Vulgar*, the *Syriac*, the *Persian*, the *Æthiopic*. And, if later Versions have any Authority, I may likewise appeal to the * *Italian*,

* Iddio erà il Verbo. Bib. Ital. Venet. 1639.

the * *Spanish*, and our † most antient *English* Translations, as well as *That* ¶ of *Martin Luther*; in all which we read, *God was the Word*, and very rarely meet with the contrary, till *Calvin's* Time, when *Servetus* endeavoured to revive the *Sabelian Heresy*. Then indeed, to confute his Notions, the *other Construction* was mightily stickled for, and so far prevailed, that it was afterwards received by *our Translators* in *K. James the First's* Reign.

AND from hence 'tis plain, that as our present Translation may very well be Taxed with *Novelty*: So *That* which I contend for, can have no such Thing laid to its Charge. 'Tis doubtless the most *Antient*, and *Universal*; but still like every Thing of that Nature, may have some Things objected to it; as

1st. THAT the *Article* δ is affix'd to $\lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron$, and not $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma$, which says *Beza*, and o-

* *Diofera la Palabra*. Test. *Castilians*. 1556: Idem *Bib. Hispan.* per *Valeram* 1602. Idem *Bib. Hispan. vulg.* 1622.

† *God þær þ̅ pop̅*. *Marshal's Anglo-Saxon* Test. *God was the Word*, *K. H. 8th's Bib.* 1541. *God was the Word*. *Coverdales* Test. 1549. So to *Q. Elizabeth's Bible*.

¶ *Und Gott war das Wort*. *Luther's Bib.* 1568.

thers;

thers, shows the *former* to be the *Subject*, and the *latter* the *Prædicate*:

To which I Answer ;

1st. THAT St. *John*, tho' he writ in *Greek*, yet observing the *Idiom* of his own *Language*, this *Observation* is of no *Force*; it being usual with the *Hebrews* to prefix their demonstrative *He*, either to the *Subject*, or *Prædicate* indifferently. *Apud Hebræos*, says *Lud. de Dieu*, *He demonstrativum promiscuè Prædicato, & subiecto præfigitur. Animad. Vol. 2. p. 452.*

2^{dly}, THAT there are a great many *Instances* to be met with both in *prophane*, and *sacred Writers*, which plainly shew, that *this Rule*, how general soever, is not every where to be depended on. Thus *Aristot.* περὶ ποιητικ. cap. 11. ἔστι ἡ περὶ παλαιὰ μὲν, ἢ εἰς τὸ ἐναντίον τῶν πραγμάτων μεταβολή. So again, c. 12. κοινὸν ἢ, πάρος μὲν, ἢ πρῶτη λέξις ὅλας χορᾶς. And thus too the *sacred Writers*: Ἀσφαλίῳ ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁ πηλός, *Genes. xi. 3.* κύριος αὐτός ἐστιν ὁ θεός. *Dominus, i. e. Jehovab, est Deus. Psal. 100.* Ἐπιδεικνύς ἔναι τὸν κύριον, ἰσοῦν. And so too our *Evangelist* himself, as I have already prov'd, πνεῦμα, ὁ θεός, c. 4. 24. πεισύνων ὅτι ἰσοῦς ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς τοῦ θεοῦ. I *Joh. 5. 5.* In all which, and a multitude of other Places,

it

it is evident, that the *Subject* wants the *Article*, and the *Prædicate* has it; so that this Objection falls to the Ground.

THE next, and I think the only remaining Charge, that can be brought against this *Translation* is, that it *seems* to confound the *Persons* in the *Trinity*, and by this Means paves the Way to *Sabellianism*. The first Part of the Objection is too clear to be disown'd. For to say, that *God* is the *Logos*, does really *sound*, as if there was no *Distinction* between the two first *PERSONS* of the *Trinity*. And so doubtless thought *St. John*, or he would never in the *Compass* of *three short Propositions* have given us *one* of them *twice over*. The *Word*, says he, *was with God*; here he notes a *personal Distinction*: And, *God was the Word*; here he expresses to us an *Identity of Nature*. And then as if he foresaw, that some *Disputes* would arise about this, to prevent them all, he *industriously repeats* what he had just said before; *the same*, that is, the *Word*, *was in the Beginning with God*. A Repetition! which lets us plainly see, that *Sabellianism* must never seek for a *Shelter* in this Place, let it be translated as it will: Tho' after all, I must observe, that, if it should, it may as easily find *one* in *The Word was God*, as in *God was the Word*.

To

To conclude these Observations ; as it is plain from what I have said, that there is all the Reason imaginable to admit of the *Version* I here contend for ; so nothing of any Moment can be urged against it. And if so, 'tis evident to the meanest Capacity, that the *Word*, which *became Flesh*, in the Man Christ Jesus, and was *one and the same Person* with him, must be God *supreme*. For if God, *the same God*, that is, and must be * acknowledged to be *supreme*, was the *Word* ; then it manifestly follows that the *Word* was that *very God*.

So plain, so full, so convincing a *Testimony* has the *Evangelist* here given us of Christ's *supreme Divinity*. And till this one Evidence be confuted, Dr. Clarke must by no Means think to run us down with greater *Numbers*, which are most of them very little or nothing to the Purpose. It may perhaps be worth HIS, and every Body's observing, That this is the only Passage in all the New Testament, in which the Nature of the *Logos* is professedly treated of, and the *Divini-*

* The Scripture when it mentions God absolutely, and by way of Eminence, always means the Person of the Father, that is, the supreme God: Particularly, when it is the Subject of a Proposition, as here θεός ἄν, &c. See Dr. Clarke's 11th Proposition. 2 Part of Scrip. Doc.

ty of it plainly, expressly, and directly asserted: In all other Places it is but occasionally, and more obscurely mentioned. And from hence it evidently follows, That this single Proposition of St. John is to be made the great fundamental Principle, to which we are to recur, in this whole Controversy. All the other Texts, that relate to this Subject, are to receive their Sense and Interpretation from This, and not This from them. And if this Method is once taken, Dr. Clarke must soon leave his talking of his Numbers of Texts: It will then appear, that his Doctrine is all his own, and does not only want a Foundation in Scripture, but plainly contradicts it.

BUT is an Article of Faith to be built on a single Text of Scripture; and that too of a dubious Construction? Let our Adversaries prove this last Part, if they can: And if they cannot, the former Part of the Question will soon be determin'd in the affirmative. As to the Construction of $\theta\epsilon\acute{o}\varsigma \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{o} \lambda\acute{o}\gamma\omicron\varsigma$, I own that it has been mistaken; and so have the most evident, and momentous Truths; which yet is no Argument that those Truths are doubtful. For my own Part, I openly and sincerely declare, that was our Saviour's supreme God-head no where else so much as hinted at in Scripture, yet I could not stand out against the 1st Verse of St. John, which more plainly tells me, that the Word

was absolutely and eminently God, than the 14th Verse does, that *He became Man*. But I need not, as if I doubted of the Strength of other Passages, lay the whole Strefs of the Question upon *This*. There are a great many other Places in the Books of the *New Testament*, that sufficiently evince the same Truth : And such, in the

4th Place, is that illustrious Passage in *St. Paul's Epistle* * to the *Philippians* : *Let this be † perceived in you, which was also in Christ Jesus, who being in the Form of God, thought it not ¶ a Spoil to be equal*

* c. 2. v. 5, 6, 7, 8.

† φερεῖσθω ἐν.

¶ ὅχι ἀρπαγμὸν ᾗσασατο, i. e. *He did not discover the Brightness of his Glory, He did not set it up, or openly show it, as Victors do a Trophée, or Spoil taken in War. Longè maximum Triumphi spectaculum fuit Cossus, spolia opima Regis interfecti gerens, in eum Milites carmina incondita, æquantes eum Romulo, canere. Spolia in æde Jovis Feretrii, prope Romuli spolia,—cum solenni Dedicatione dono fixit. Liv. Dec. 1. L. 4. And in another Place, Inde exercitu victore reducto, ipse [Romulus] cum Factis vir magnificus, tum Factorum OSTENTATOR haud minor, SPOLIA ducis Hostium cæsi suspensa, fabricato ad id apte ferculo, gerens in Capitolium ascendit. Far was the humble Jesus from displaying his divine Majesty in such a manner, when he appear'd on Earth; and therefore says the Apostle*

with God ; but made * himself to appear of no Account, taking the Form of a Servant, being made in the Likeness of Men ; and being found in Fashion as a Man, he humbled himself [still farther] becoming submissive unto Death, yea the Death of the Cross.

An illustrious Testimony indeed ! Christ, says the Apostle, *was in the Form of God*, that is, he was in the *Nature of God*, or *God himself*. For nothing properly speaking, can have the *Form* of any thing, but it must too have its several *Qualities* and *Properties*, and by consequence its *Nature*. From whence it is, that (without running to the *School-men*) we frequently find the *Form* of a *Thing* to be put for the *Nature* of that *Thing*, or the *Thing* it self ; as, amongst the *Latins*, the *Form* ¶ of a *Province*

triumphant show of it ; but on the contrary concealed its Brightness, and so far humbled himself, as to appear under the lowest Circumstances of Human Nature.

* ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν : κενωθῆ, says Hesychius, is μεταίῳ δοξαζομένη ; whence ἐκένωσεν ἑαυτὸν, must be, μεταίῳ δοξαζομένη ἐποίησεν ἑαυτὸν. And from hence it appears, that Dr. Clarke's Devested himself, is nothing to the purpose.

¶ Ap. Cic. Liv. cæterosq; ferè omnes Historicos.

for

for a Province; the *Form* of a Republic for a Republic; just as, amongst the Hellenists, the * *Likeness* of a Temple is used for a Temple, and the † *Likeness* of an Image for an Image. Phrases, which give a great Illustration to St. Paul's way of speaking in this Place, and help us to a clear Conception of what he meant to express.

Add to this, that if no other *Author* did, yet St. Paul himself has sufficiently explain'd this Phrase, by setting it in Opposition to the *Form* of a Servant, and telling us how Christ was in that. Christ (says he) tho' he was in the *Form* of God, yet condescended to take the *Form* of a Servant. But how did he take, or how was he in the *Form* of a Servant? Why, says St. Paul, as he was made in the *Likeness* of Men; μορφὴν θεῶν λαβὼν, ἐν ὁμοιώματι ἀνθρώπων γενόμενος; he was in the *Form* of a Servant, being made in the *Likeness* of Men. As much therefore as he was Man, so much he was a Servant: But he was really, and truly, and absolutely Man; and therefore he was really, and

* ὡς ὁμοίωμα θεῶν, Psal. cxliv. 12.

† ἐν ὁμοιώματι εἰκόνος φθαγῆτος ἀνθρώπου.
Rom. i. 23.

truly,

truly, and absolutely * a *Servant*; and by consequence, from *St. Paul's way of speaking*, must be as really, and truly, and absolutely *God*, as he was *either* of the *other*.

THUS *St. Paul* interprets himself, and I know not where we shall find a better *Expositor*.

LET us however inquire into the Sense of *other Interpreters*: Let them tell us, how *Christ* was in the *Form of God*, if he was not really *God*. And

1st. We are told by the *Arians*, that *Christ* was in the *Form of God*, as † He was the *Person by whom God* created all things, by whom he governs all things, and by whom he appeared to *Adam*, to the *Patriarchs*, and to *Moses*. This, say they, was being in the *Form of God*.

BUT to this I answer, that in *Two* of the forementioned *Instances*, *Christ* could

* What therefore *Dr. Bennet* says, (*Dis. Trin.* p. 49, 90.) first putting the *Question*, whether *Christ* was really and truly a *Servant*, and then answering, nothing less, is certainly a very great *Mistake*. He was not indeed a *Slave*, by *Condition of Life*, but was a *Servant*, by *Necessity of Nature*; a *Servant to God*, and *Subject to Men*. See *Isai. xlix. 3. 7. Thou art my Servant* — A *Servant of Rulers*.

† See *Dr. Clarke's Scrip. Doc.* p. 155.

not

not be said to BE *in the Form of God*, at the very Instant he became *Man*, which is the thing ¶ asserted by St. Paul. For let us, in the *First Place*, suppose, that the *Logos* was a θεὸς ὑπαρχὸς, or a *subordinate Agent* in the *Creation* of the Universe, yet it would be very *improper* to say, that He was for this Reason *in the Form of God*, when He took upon Him *human Nature*. That he *had been* might (in this Case) be allow'd. But to tell us that at the very Time he assumed our Nature, he was then ἐν μορφῇ θεῷ ὑπάρχων, then actually subsisting in the *Form of God*, because he had formerly been God's *Vice-gerent* in the *Creation* of the World, is highly absurd; since at this rate we might argue, that one who performs a *Miracle*, and by doing so, may be said (in some Sense) to be *in the Form of God*, must still be in the same *Form*, at any time afterward, even when he works no *Miracle* at all. But

2dly. Neither was Christ, at the Time of his *Incarnation*, in the *Form of God*, as he is supposed to have appear'd, in God's stead, to Adam, to the Patriarchs, and to Moses. At the very Instant of his appearing to them, it might be said, that (tho' he was not

¶ ἐν μορφῇ θεῷ ὑπάρχων.

really

really God) yet He was in the Form of God: But several Thousands of Years afterwards; I think it could not. An Ambassador, while he remains such, may be said to be the Image and Representation of his Prince: And yet need any one be told, that His Office, and his Titles expire together?

ADD to these Two Considerations that the bare allowing our Saviour to be the Person who created the World, and appeared to the Patriarchs, and to Moses, is really granting Him to be God supreme. For in the

1st Case, we are inform'd by Moses, that God only SPAKE, and the World was instantly and immediately made. And *who* was the God that spake? Was it God the Father? If so, the Son could by no Means be an Instrument in the Creation, because there was no Room left for any such thing. And supposing it was God the Logos, then must it necessarily follow, that HE is God supreme; the Word GOD, as Dr. Clarke observes, being no where put absolutely in Scripture, or made the Subject of a Proposition, as God said, &c. but it signifies God most high. And then

2dly,

2dly, If *Christ* was the *Person*, who appear-
 ed to the *Patriarchs*, and to *Moses*, then it
 was *Christ*, who said, *I am * the God of*
thy Father, the God of Abraham, the God
of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; it was
Christ, who said, *I † am that I am*; it
 was *Christ* who told *Moses*, that He ¶ could
 not see his *Face*, that is, that He was the
invisible one, whom no Man has seen, nor
can see; all which are the distinguishing
Marks and Characters of God supreme. I
 do not see what can be said to this last In-
 stance. But for the *other* we are told, that
 ** *Christ* did not speak in his *own*, but in
 the *Name and Person of the Father*, whose
Representative He was. But does the *Scripture*
 say so? Or does it any where give us
 an *Example*, where any *Being* but *God* as-
 sumes to it self the *Name and Person of*
God? And if it does not, is it not the high-
 est *Presumption* imaginable to talk at this
 rate? *Dr. Clarke* indeed pretends to give
 us an *Instance*, where even || an *inferior An-*
gel is introduced speaking in the *Name,*
or Person of God. The †† *Angel stood,*
saying — I will give Power unto MY
two Witnesses. And is not this an amazing

* *Exod. iii. 6.* † *v. 14. ibid.* ¶ *Exod.*
xxxiii. 20. ** *Scrip. Doc. p. 97.* || *Rep.*
to Mr. Nelson, p. 162. †† *Rev. xi. 1-3.*

one? Would not one think, that this *wonderful Critic* had never look'd into his *Greek Testament*? And yet he can be *sharp-sighted* enough, when he pleases: But here, it seems, it was his best way to *wink*, and not see what so clearly makes against him. That our present * *English Translation* has those Words in it, *The Angel stood*, is very certain. But that they are *wanting* in almost all the antient *Manuscripts*, in *Arethas*, in the *Vulgar*, *Arabic*, and *Æthiopic Versions*, and by consequence ought to have been *omitted* in *ours*, is what cannot be denied. And where now is this *inferior Angel*? Why still, I warrant the Word ἄγγελος must be understood as the *Substantive* to λέγων. But why not φωνὴ ἐν τῷ ἄγγελῳ, which we find in the 8th v. of the former *Chapter*, and with a great deal better *reason*, as the *Vision*, in which the *Angel* spoke, is *concluded*, and a *new one* begins here? Add to this, that in the *Velesian Lections*, it is not λέγων, but ἐρρήθη μοι, just as immediately before ἐδόθη μοι; and so too the *Vulgar* has it, as well as our most antient *English Translations*. Well! but still it is the *Angel*. For in the 8th v. of this *Chapter*, he speaks of *Christ* under the *Title* of

* Our most ancient Versions, those I mean of *Tindal* and *Coverdale*, have them not.

OUR *Lord*; and therefore he could not be more than a *created Angel*. But alas! how unlucky it is, that instead of *ἡμεῖς*, our Critics must be forced to read *ἡμεῖς αὐτῶν*. For not only the *Alexandrian*, but all the best *Manuscripts*, all the *Translations*, the *Vulgar*, the *Syriac*, the *Arabic*, and *Æthiopic*, oblige us to own this for the *genuine Reading*. And *Arethas* too confirms it in his *Commentary*, where he tells us that *αὐτῶν* is referr'd to the *Two Witnesses* mention'd before. And therefore once more let me ask the *learned Doctor*, where this *inferior Angel* is, that *speaks* in the *Name*, and *Person* of the *Father*? I am sure *He* is not here: And I challenge the *Dr.* to find *him* in any other Place. What *Dr. Bennet* says in Defence of this absurd Opinion, is so weak, that nothing can be more so, except *Dr. Clarke's* referring to it.

BUT I must not forget, that, according to *Dr. Clarke*, there remains still a *third Manner* of *Christ's* being in the *Form* of *God*. And this, it seems, is his being *God's Vice-gerent* in the *Government* of the *World*. But as there is no Proof * alleged for this; so it may as easily be *denied* on one *Hand*, as *affirmed* on the other: Posi-

* See *Scrip. Doc.* p. 155.

tive Assertions in these Cases, are but mere Cyphers, and stand for nothing. 'Tis *Proof* that we call for: And before this Instance is admitted, it must be *proved* to us, that the *Logos*, before it *became Flesh*, had no more than a *vicarious* Government of the World, held by him, as a Being *distinct* from, and *inferior* to the *God of Heaven, and Earth*. But this perhaps may look like *Imposition*, and is indeed a Task, which with regard to its Difficulty, is too unreasonable.

LET US now pass on to a *second Sort* of * *Interpreters*, and see what they say to this Matter. How was Christ *in the Form* of the *most high God*, if he was not *that God himself*? Why, say they, *As he had the Power of working Miracles, thereby appearing even AS God himself: and when He laid down this Power, then it was that He took upon him the Form of a Servant, and became an ordinary Man.*

THIS is their Interpretation; and such a one as is just as *Lame* as the former. For

1st. IF Christ's being *in the Form* of *God*, consisted only in his *Working* of *Miracles*, and his being *in the Form* of a *Servant*, in his *ceasing* to do so; this latter

should have been express'd to us, not by his *Taking*, but *Retaking* the *Form* of a *Servant* ; since He *had been* in that *Form* before, *had been* as an *ordinary Man* before, and wrought no *Miracles*, till he was about *Thirty Years* old.

A D D to this, in the 2d Place, That to the very *moment* of his *Death*, Christ never *laid down* his *Power* of working *Miracles*: And therefore if Christ's having, and exerting this *Power*, was his being in the *Form of God* ; from the *Commencement* of his *Ministry*, he *always* was in this *Form*, and never parted with it for any other.

A D D, in the last Place, What the learned *Whitby* * observes, " That the *Power* of *Miracles* is never in the *Scripture* styled the *Form of God*: And were this all that was intended by that Phrase, both *Moses*, and *Elias*, and our Lord's *Apostles*, might upon that Account be said to have been in the *Form of God*, seeing both *Moses* and *Elias* wrought many *Miracles* on Earth, and *Christ* declared concerning his *Disciples*, that *They* should work *greater Miracles than those which he had done* ;" and consequently, after this way of speak-

* *Whitby* in loc.

ing, should be more *in the Form of God*, than He himself was, which is the greatest Absurdity.

THE Socinians therefore, are as wide of the Mark in *their Interpretation* of this Phrase, as the Arians are in *theirs*. And to shew Both of them still farther, that ἐν μορφῇ θεῶς is not capable of the Sense they would either of them put upon it, I once more return to the Words of the Apostle, which are each of them so exceeding weighty, that they cannot be too well considered. And here I observe, that St. Paul does not barely say, that Christ WAS in the Form of God, but that He *was* in it by Nature. ὁ ἐν μορφῇ θεῶς ὑπάρχων, who being BORN or * PRODUCED in the Form of God: For so the Word ὑπάρχων properly signifies. ὑπάρχων, πεφυκώς † ὢν, says Hesychius. From whence 'tis plain, that St. Paul has an Eye to Christ's ETERNAL GENERATION, which he here

* Always existing in, &c, says the Arabic Version, which plainly supposes his being Born in it.

† Thus Acts xvi. 3. Ἕλλην ὑπήρχεν, i. e. Genere erat Græcus. And so v. 20. ibid. Ἰσθαῖοι ὑπάρχοντες, Genere Judæi. And (tho' ὑπάρχων is sometimes put barely for ὢν, as ὑπάρχων ἐν βασιλείᾳ yet) this being the proper Sense of the Word, it should always have it, where the Subject 'tis applied to will bear it.

beauti-

beautifully OPPOSES to his TEMPORAL one, and tells us, that tho' Christ, *as the eternal Son of God*, was BORN in the *Form of God*, as much as a Son amongst us is BORN in the *Form of his Father*, yet, notwithstanding this, He stooped so low, as at his SECOND GENERATION to take, and to be Born in the *Form of a Man*.

IN a word ; from the whole, 'tis as evident, I think, as Words can make it, that this Passage of *St. Paul's* is to be understood as I have already explained it, namely, That Christ's *being in the Form of God*, is the very same with, and can be nothing else but, His *being in the Nature of God*; his being as really and essentially, before his *Incarnation*, in *this*, as he was afterwards in *that* of Man.

5. I now proceed to a 5th Testimony, taken from the same inspired Author, which of it self, I think, might be sufficient to end the Dispute. Hear what he says. *Tho' there be * that are called Gods, whether † in*

* 1 Corinth. viii. 5, 6.

† By the Gods and Lords of Heaven, are meant the Sun, and the rest of the heavenly Host; and by those in Earth, the Idols, the Images, the Stocks, and Stones, which the Heathens stupidly fancied to be Gods, and worshiped them as such.

Ccr-

Heaven, or in Earth (as, or, after which manner, there be Gods many, and Lords many;) yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in Him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by Him.

HERE it is evident, that as the Lords many are reckoned by St. Paul amongst the Gods; so our Saviour, in opposition to them, is called the One Lord, or the One God: For if the many Lords were Gods, it plainly follows that He who is the one Lord, must be the one God too; which is all that we contend for.

WELL! will Dr. Clarke say, and so He is: But then He is only the one inferior God. The Lords many that St. Paul speaks of are the Baalim, and the Baalim were only

Certain it is, that the Angels are not intended by the First, nor Kings and Magistrates by the Second, neither of these being Objects of religious Worship amongst the Heathens, as the Gods and Lords here spoke of manifestly were. I have sometimes thought, that the Gods and Lords in Heaven, were the *Dij superi*, and those in Earth, the *θεοὶ καὶ δυνάμεις*, the infernal Deities; as if ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς was *ἐν τῇ γῇ*, intra Terram, just as ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει is intra Montem. But whether this will hold good, or no, let the Learned determine. I do not find that the Phrase is used in this Sense by St. Paul elsewhere, and therefore I insist not upon it here.

the

*the inferior, mediating Deities. But who told him they were such? Why the learned Mr. Mede, it seems, has * said so: And (as if a great Man could not be mistaken) the Dr. has made a Transcript of his Words, without endeavouring to strengthen them by any farther Evidence.*

BUT tho' *Plato* is my *Friend*, yet must *Truth* be more so: 'Tis impossible for me but to pay the utmost regard, not only to the *Judgment*, but to the very *Name*, and *Memory* of *Mr. Mede*; and yet I cannot help saying, that as that *admirable Man* had his *Errors*, and *Over-sights*, so *this* was one of *them*. For so far were the *Baalim* from being reckon'd the *inferior, mediating Deities*, that on the contrary, (as I shall make it appear) they were always look'd upon

* Though there be Gods many (*that is many Celestial and Sovereign Deities*) and Lords many; (*that is, so many Baalims, Lords-Agents, and Presidents of earthly things*) yet to us Christians there is but one Sovereign God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we [*ἐἰς αὐτόν*, as it is in the Greek] To him (*that is, to whom as Supreme we are to direct all our Services*; and but one Lord, *Jesus Christ*, one Lord-Agent (*instead of their many Baalims, and Dæmon-Mediators*), by whom are all things, which come from the Father to us, and through whom alone we find Access unto him. *Mede, Dis. 2 Pet. ii. 1. See Scrip. Doc. p. 6.*

as *Gods* of the highest Rank and Order. And this I infer

1st. FROM the Name of Baal it self; which signifies * one that has Power, Possession, and Dominion: A Name, very improper for an inferior, puny Deity, that can grant his Worshippers nothing, but what he must first beg himself from his Superiors!

Secondly, FROM that Degree of Honour, and Esteem, the greatest and highest of all other, which was paid to these Baalim by their ignorant Worshippers. This we may collect from the Scripture's always assigning them the † first Place, when it

* Baal (*says the learned Fuller*) *κύριος*, vel Dominum sonat, vel Possessorem, & Potestatem in rem aliquam habentem. Vide Fulleri Miscel. l. 2. c. 7. So also Dr. Pococke in his Comment. on Hosea, p: 58. The word Baal, signifying Lord, or Patron, — (Though some think it applicable to those, whom they called lesser Gods, or middle Gods) may seem to have been a Name given to any chief, or principal Idol.

† Thus Judges ii. 13. we find Baalim, and Ashtaroth; and 2 Kings xxiii. 5. Baal the Sun, the Moon, the Planets, and all the Host of Heaven. And so Isaiah xlv. 1. Bel and Nebo. In all which Places and several others that might be produced, the Baalim have still the Precedency given them to all other Idols; and this,

happens to mention *them* with other Idols; and no less from the numerous * Testimonies of the *best* and *most judicious* Writers, all of them agreeing, that the *Baalim* were

no doubt, because they were reckon'd superior to them.

* Thus Junius notes on Baruc vi. 40. that Bel (the same with Baal) was the summus Deus amongst the Chaldæans; and then adds, Quum Dii minerum gentium curare non possunt, recurrunt ad eum qui in summâ apud Babylonios, & Assyrios existimatione est. So Vatab. in Esai. xlv. 1. says Bel erat Idolum primæ Authoritatis. And Tremel. ibid. [Bel] nomen est Idoli, quod unum in pretio fuit apud Assyrios Persas, & Babylonios: Alij Saturnum esse volunt, filium Oceani: alij Jovem, (unde Jupiter Belus appellatur Plinio. lib. 6. natur. Histor. cap. 26.) alij deniq; solem, quod magis probamus, quia solem ab Assyriis, Persis, & Babylonis, pro Deo summo habitum esse — omnes Historiæ ostendunt. And to come a little more Westward to the Baal of the Tyrians, and Sidonians, (the same Baal, whose Worship was introduced by Ahab among the Israelites, in Opposition to that of the great Jehovah) the learned Fuller tells us, Miscel. l. 2. c. 7. that this was no other than Magnus ille ἀλεξάνων, seu Malorum depulsor Hercules, summus & antiquissimus Tyriorum Deus, ut qui & præcipuo semper honore ibi sit affectus. To all these, let me add the Authority of the learned Selden, the best Judge in this matter, whom see in his admirable Book de Diis Syris. Syntag. 2.

the *supreme* Objects of Worship to the *Eastern Idolaters*.

Thirdly, FROM the *Baalim* sometimes being called * *the Idols*, by way of *Eminence*; sometimes being put for † *the whole Heavenly Host*, the great *Pan* of the *Gentiles*, and sometimes § *for all the heathen Gods in general*. For we must conclude those to be *the Chief of a Species*, who give a *Denomination* to all the rest belonging to it.

THIS is sufficient to let us see, that the *Baalim* have always been look'd upon by the *Gentile World* as their *superior Deities*. And therefore if the *Lords many*, mentioned by *St. Paul*, are these *Baalim*, they

* So in 2 Chronic. xvii. 3. instead of *Baalim*, which is in the Hebrew, *the 70 have it*, *עֵלֹהִים*.

† See Selden de Diis Syris. Pococke on Hosea, p. 58. and Fuller's Miscel. l. 4. c. 7.

§ So 1 Sam. vii. 4. *They took away Baalim and Astaroth, i. e. all their Gods*. And so Vatab. *Baalim, masculinum est, Astaroth, fæmininum; & videntur his vocibus significari Dij Deaq; Gentium*. The learned Selden is more full and express: *Generale Deorum nomen Baal fuisse scimus*. De Diis Syris. Syntag. 2. To this let me add, that as *Baalim* are put for the *Heathen Gods in general*, so they are never used for the *inferior Deities in particular*.

are

are so far from being only *inferior and mediating Gods*, that they plainly appear to have been the *First and Greatest* of the *Heathen Deities*. From whence we may fairly draw this Conclusion, that since *the Lords many*, our Saviour is opposed to as *the one true Lord*, were *sovereign and supreme*, it necessarily follows, that he must be so too, and by consequence must be *the one God over all, blessed for ever*.

BUT how can all this be? Are not the *Three Persons* of the *B. Trinity* included under the general Denomination of *the Father*? For otherwise *the Holy Ghost* is excluded from being an *Object* of the *Christian Worship*. And if *these Three* are in the *first Place* said to be *the one God*; is it not *THE MAN* Christ Jesus that the *Apostle* speaks of afterwards? And can *HE* be said to be *the One supreme Lord*?

AND this helps to let us see, by what *Right*, and for what *Reason*, the *B. Jesus* has a *Title* given him, that belongs only to the *sovereign Ruler of the Universe*, to *Him*, who is *the blessed and only Potentate, King of Kings, and Lord of Lords*. For as *MAN*, or indeed as any other *BEING* inferior to the *supreme Lord of Heaven and Earth*, 'tis plain, that *He* could not have it. But let us once consider *Him* in that glorious *Light* in which *St. John* has placed *Him*; let us consider *Him* as the *di-*
vine

vine *Logos* made *Flesh*, as being *One* with *God*, and *God* with *Him*; and the *Question* is immediately resolved. As to us *Christians*, says *St. Paul*, we worship *one God, the Father*; and in the *Unity* of *this God*, as being made *the same Person* with *Him, one Lord, Christ Jesus*.

AND thus is *Zachariah's* * *Prophecy* fulfill'd, that there should be *One Lord*, and *his Name* should be *One*: which cannot be, if, according to the *Arians*, there are still *Two Lords*, a greater, and a less. And thus too is our *Saviour* excellently opposed as *one Lord* to the many *Lords*, or *Baalims* of the *Gentiles*. For the *Baalim* were merely *MEN*, who after their *Decease* were reputed *sovereign Gods*, and worshiped under the *Names* of *Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, Apollo*, and the like; which was *absolute Idolatry*: Whereas the *B. Jesus*, tho' He was truly *MAN*, was a great deal more, was, by a *personal Conjunction* with the *Logos*, made *One* with the most high *God*; and therefore not only *MAY*, but *MUST BE* made the *Object* of our *supreme Adoration*.

THESE are some of the many noble *Attestations* which the *Spirit of Truth* has given us of our *B. Saviour's supreme Godhead*. And suppose, after all, that it had

* Zech. xiv. 9. * ἕξαι κ' ἐν ᾧ ἔς, καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἓν.

pleased this good Spirit to have granted us none of these; yet is there *one Argument* still left for the Truth of this *Doctrine*, which, let Wit and Malice do their utmost, can never be answered, or so much as tolerably evaded; I mean that which is taken from our Saviour's being invocated, and prayed unto by the first CHRISTIANS.

THAT our B. Saviour had this Sort of Worship paid to Him by the first Christians, is evident from hence, that they are set down in Scripture, as People, whose distinguishing Character it was, that They called upon the Name of Christ. Thus Ananias tells our Lord, when He appear'd to him in a Vision, that St. Paul had Authority from the chief Priests to bind all that Called * on

* Acts ix. 14. τοῖς ἐπικαλούμενοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. The learned Dr. Hammond in his Note on this Place, would have ἐπικαλούμενοις to be taken passively, and the whole Phrase to signify no more than this, that They were Called by the Name of Christ. This he endeavours to prove from some Instances, which are very far fetch'd, and nothing to the Purpose, as any one will perceive, who is pleased to consult him, and at the same time compare his with the following Examples: As Psal. cv. 1. O give thanks unto the Lord, and ἐπικαλεῖσθε τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, Call upon his Name. And Zech. xiii. 9. ἐπικαλέσεται τὸ ὄνομα μου, He shall call upon my Name, and I will hear him. So Psal. cxvi. 13. I will receive the Cup

that Name. And thus St. Paul writing to the Christians at Corinth, addresses himself to all those, who Called upon the Name of Christ. And thus lastly Ananias * advises Saul; Be baptized, and wash away thy Sins, (ἐπικαλεσάμενοι) having [first] called upon the Name of the Lord, i. e. of Jesus, as plainly appears from the Context, and several other Circumstances.

ADD to this, that the Scripture does not only tell us in general, that our Saviour was invoked by the first Christians, but gives us some particular Instances, and Examples of his being so.

One of these, I think, is to be met with in the 1st Chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, when the Eleven pray thus: Thou Lord, who knowest the Hearts of all Men, shew which of these Two thou hast chosen, to take Part of that Ministry and Apostleship, from which Judas by transgression fell. A Prayer! which is express'd in such a manner, that to me

Cup of Salvation, and τὸ ὄνομα θεῷ ἐπικαλεσάμεναι; Call upon the Name of the Lord. And Psal. xcix. 6. Moses and Samuel ἐν τοῖς ἐπικαλεσμένοις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, inter eos qui Invocant nomen ejus, among those who call'd upon this Name, ἐπικαλέσθη τὸν κύριον. And to these might be added abundance of other Instances if I thought there was the least occasion for them.

* Acts xxii. 16.

it plainly enough Points out the Person it was directed to: For

1st. THAT our Saviour *knew the Hearts of all Men*, was a Truth which the Apostles could not but be convinced of, from the Discovery which He had made of Judas his Treachery, and what he said to them * on that Occasion. *I know* (says he) *whom I have chosen: But that the Scripture may be fulfilled, He that eateth Bread with me hath lift up his Heel against me.* Now I tell it you, before it come to pass, that when it is come to pass, ye may believe that I am He. Which very Passage, as the Expressions in the Apostles Prayer seem to refer to; so the Occasion of it plainly tells us, that they actually did so. But

2ly, As our Blessed Saviour thus *knew* whom to choose, so it is not to be doubted but that He had the Power of Choosing. While He was then upon Earth, 'tis plain, that He called his Apostles himself; and His Power was so far from being lessened after His Resurrection, that it was augmented to an higher Degree than ever it was before. All † Power, says he, is given to me in Hea-

* John xiii. 18, 19.

† Matth. xxviii. 18. see Scrip. Doct. p. 122.

ven and in Earth. And if *All*, then sure the Power of filling up a vacant Apostleship.

3. ADD to this, that our Saviour does not only acquaint his Disciples, that he was invested with this Power, but that he would actually exert it. Lo, says he, *I am with you always unto the End of the World*. How? By guiding their Actions in the most extraordinary manner, and Directing them in every thing that related to their Ministry.

LET these Circumstances be but duly considered; and I fancy it will scarce be ambiguous * to any Body, whether the Words are directed to Christ, or to God the Father.

BUT suppose after all, (without granting it) that this Instance should be dubious: Yet what shall we make of St. Stephen's Prayer, *Lord † Jesus receive my Spirit*? Is this a Prayer? Is the Object of it ambiguous? Or has it any Fault, except that in both these Points, it is too plain, too certain, too evident? And yet Mr. Emlyn seems very desirous to find one? But has he found it? Why yes, being sharp-sighted, where it was not. For, says he, Stephen SAW HIM VI-

* Acts vii. 59.

† Collection of Tracts p. 55.

SIBLY But where, or when did St. Stephen SEE Christ VISIBLY? Why, he SAW HIM *standing at God's right Hand*, v. 56. And *therefore* he SAW him standing there, v. 59. Tho' betwixt the *one* and the *other* so much Time had pass'd, that he was dragged from the COUNCIL out of the CITY. A notable Consequence indeed! I wish this *ingenious Gentleman* would not be so rash in his Conclusions: He seems in this Case to have attended more to the *ordinary Painters*, than to the *inspired Historian*: I have seen the *great Martyr DRAWN* by these as he describes him; but I think, without any *Authority* from their *sacred Maker*.

BUT what does all this tend to? What tho' Christ was *invoked* by St. Stephen, and the rest of his *first*, and *purest* Followers? This, says an *Adversary*, does by no means *prove* what you aim at; this is no *Demonstration* that Christ is *God supreme*; since 'tis possible, that GOD may *Appoint* a BEING *Inferior* to himself to be *invoked* by us, so it is but in a *secondary, subordinate Way*, and so long as the *Worship* is directed to himself, as the *ultimate Object* of it. And in this *Way*, say they, was our Saviour *invoked* by his *first Disciples*.

THIS is the *common Evasion* in this Case, and begins *now-a-days* to be made

use of with *uncommon Assurance*. Let us therefore examine the *Strength* of it And

FIRST, Let us *search* into *Matter of Fact*, and *inquire* whether our *Saviour* was *invoked* by the *first Christians* in a *subordinate Manner*, or not: In doing which, the best Way will be to take a View of the several *Instances* that relate to this Matter, and from thence see to which Side the *Ballance* inclines.

Now the *1st Instance* of this Sort, is that which I have already taken Notice of in the *1st Chapter of the Acts*, where *Christ* (as I have proved) is *invoked* by the *eleven Apostles*: And how, let the *Prayer* it self *determine*. *Thou Lord [Jesus]* who knowest the *Hearts of all Men*, shew which of these *Two* thou hast chosen. Have we any *Mark* here of the *Person of the Father's* being made the *ultimate Object* of this *Invocation*? Is He once *refer'd to*, or in the least *hinted at*, in any *Part or Expression* of it? No such Thing. It was *Christ alone* that was to shew; it was *Christ alone* that had chosen: And this (for any thing that appears to the contrary) in the *highest and most absolute Sense* that could be.

THE next *Instance* is that we meet with in the *History of St. Stephen*, which is exactly of the same Nature with the former: He resigns his *Soul* in the same *absolute*
Man-

Manner to his Saviour in which Christ had recommended His into the Hands of his Father : He addresses himself to the Blessed Jesus, not as his Mediator, but his God : He does not pray him to intercede with his Father to receive his Soul ; but beseeches him to accept it Himself : Lord Jesus, says he, receive my Spirit. And if what follows be a Continuation of this Prayer to the same Person, (as it plainly seems to be ;) this at once puts an End to the Question ; since it evidently shews us, that it must be address'd to him as the Supreme God, and no other. Lord, says he, lay not this Sin to their Charge, that is, forgive it them : A Thing ! which except He was God, in the highest Sense of the Word, was utterly out of his Power to do : For as the Right of Pardoning naturally infers Supremacy ; so must it go along with it, and cannot be separated from it.

A 3d Instance is that of St. Paul's Praying to * Christ to deliver him from his

* 2 Corinth. xii. 8. That the κύριος here prayed to, is our Saviour, appears from the Context. For Him, ὑπὲρ πάντων ἰ. ε. ἀγγέλων, I besought the Lord thrice, that he might depart from me. And he said unto me, my Grace is sufficient for thee. ἡ δὲ δύναμις μου, For my Power is made to appear perfect by Weakness. Most gladly therefore will I rather

Temptations. *I besought the Lord thrice, that [the Messenger of Satan] might depart from me, An Instance!* where I think there is not the least Footsteps of an inferior Invocation. The Apostle (as far as we can see) directs his Petition *only* to his Saviour, and begs of *Him*, without any Reference (that appears) to any other Person, that *He* would be his gracious Deliverer. *I besought the Lord thrice*, says he. What to do? Not to mediate for his Deliverance, but to deliver him himself. *I besought the Lord thrice, that he might depart*, or as the *Æthiopic Version*, has it, that He would * drive him, from me.

AND from thence we may learn what Judgment to pass on that celebrated Instance in the Revelation of St. John, where the Elders sing a new Song, falling down before the Lamb, and saying—Thou † art worthy—For thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us unto God by thy Blood. The

ther glory in my Weaknesses, that δύναμις τῷ Χριστῷ, the Power of Christ may rest upon me. It was therefore Christ's Power, that was made illustrious by the Weakness of others: It was therefore Christ, who made Answer to St. Paul's Petition; and, by Consequence, it must be Christ that St. Paul here prayed to.

* ἀποσῆ ἀπ' ἐμῆ. † Rev. v. 9.

learned

learned Dr. Clarke * would fain raise an Argument from hence, that *Christ* is only to be *Worshipped* as our Redeemer, Mediator, and Intercessor. But why so? Are not the abovementioned Instances *Proofs* of the contrary? And will any Man say, that because God is said † to be *worthy of Glory and Honour, and Power*, on the Account of his having created all Things, that therefore He is to be worshipped only as he is our Creator? By no means: *these* and the like Expressions, are only special Motives to excite our Gratitude and Thankfulness; but are far from being the sole Reasons of Divine Worship.

BUT does the *Scripture* mention no such thing as a *relative* and *subordinate* Worship? Is not it said, that *Christ* should be worshipped and confess'd TO the Glory of God the Father? So indeed our Translation says. But I do not find that St. Paul says any such Thing. What he tells us (if I can read it) is not that Ἰησοῦς χριστὸς κύριος, that *Jesus Christ is Lord*; but κύριος Ἰησοῦς χριστός, *The Lord Jesus Christ is* (what?) εἰς δόξαν θεῶν πατέρων, *In the Glory of God the Father*. And how do our *Arian Critics* approve of this? Or dare they venture to disprove it?

* Scrip. Doct. p. 342, 343. † Rev. iv. 11.

They have nothing but poor εἰς that so much as seems to favour them : And even *that* * if they rely upon it, will certainly fail them. But in the mean time, what will they say to the *Order of the Words*, and the *Authority* not only of the *Vulgar*, but of the *Arabic*, and *Æthiopic Versions*; not to pass by (what is of greater weight than all these) the Context it self ; God, says the Apostle very highly *exalted* (the Man *Christ Jesus*, on the Account of *great* and *voluntary* Sufferings,) and gave Him, the † Name ABOVE EVERY NAME; that is, he gave him *his Own*: For ¶ there is, *none other* that is *above* every Name : He declared him, as it

* Nothing is more frequent than for the Præposition εἰς to signify ἐν in the Sacred Writings. Thus A&S viii. 23. εἰς χολὴν πικρίας ὁρῶ σε ὄντα, I perceive thee to be in the Gall of Bitterness. So Mat. ii. 23. He dwelt εἰς πόλιν, in a City—— And so (not to mention other Places almost innumerable) we find it used John i 18. ὁ ἔν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, He who (now) is in the Bosom of the Father ; where I doubt not but St. John means the very same Thing by Christ's being εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρὸς, that St. Paul does by εἰς δόξαν θεῶν πατρὸς.

† ὄνομα τὸ ὑπὲρ πάντων ὀνομα; Or, as the Alex. and Colbert. Copies read it, τὸ ὄνομα τὸ κ. τ. λ.

¶ τὸ ὄνυμα τὸ, ἐντιμον, τὸ θαυμαστὸν τῷ το, ΚΥΡΙΟΝ τὸ θεόν σε. Deut. xxviii. Scient quod Nomen tuum, O Jehovah, solum est excellissimum super terram. Psal. lxxxiii.

were

were by Marriage * to be made One with himself, and that to this very End and Purpose, that at, or rather, TO † the Name of Jesus every Knee should bow, and every Tongue confess TO, or PRAISE, IT, BE-

* By God's communicating his Name to the Blessed Jesus, he seems to allude to the known Custom of the Wife's receiving the Name of her Husband: as Isaiah iv. 1. τὸ ὄνομα τὸ σὸν κληθήσεται ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, and by this shadows out to us the mysterious Union of the Divine and Human Nature, now compleated by Marriage, as before it was by Contract.

† I say, rather TO the Name, not only because ἐν is oftentimes, and must be here, put only for a Sign to the Dative Case, as 1 Cor. xiv. 11. ὁ λαλῶν ἐν ἐμοὶ βάρβαρος, He that speaketh is a Barbarian to me;) but likewise because I doubt not but St. Paul writ it simply ὀνόματι, which is more than probable from hence, that the 70 in the Passage which St Paul here alludes to, do not write ἐν ἐμοὶ κάμψαι, but simply ἐμοὶ; and so St. Paul himself cites it, Rom. xiv. 11. In analogy to which, we may reasonably conclude, that the Apostles wrote it here, ὀνόματι, and not ἐν ὀνόματι, and to the Æthiopic Version has it. However this be, I make no Scruple to affirm, that τὰς ὀνόματι Ἰησοῦ, is to be supplied διὰ κοινού, and joined with ἐξομολογήσεται: and by Consequence that the Translation should be as I have given it. Ἐξομολογῶμαι, ἐν χειρὶ ἡ ἀντὶ τῆς χάριτος ὁμολογῶ, ἡγὼν, δοξάζω σε ὡς τὸ ἐξομολογῶμαί σοι, πάντες; says Phavorinus And so St. Paul himself, in a Passage exactly parallel to

CAUSE * *the Lord Jesus Christ is in the Glory of God the Father, is elevated to the same Glorious Majesty, and Sovereignty with Him, or (which is the same thing, and comes nearer too, I think, to what St. Paul means by εἰς δόξαν † θεοῦ πατρὸς) is in, and one with, God Most High.*

this, where he is speaking of our Saviour : We must all stand before the Judgment-Seat of Christ : For it is written, As I live, saith the Lord, to me every Knee shall Bow, of things Celestial, Terrestrial, and Subterrestrial, and every Tongue, ὁμολογήσει τῷ τῷ θεῷ shall Glorify God. And in this Sense, and with this Construction, must the Word be taken in the place now before us, and cannot be used in any other.

* ὅτι, quia quoniam, as, ὅτι ἐγὼ ζῶ, Because I live, ye shall, &c. John xiv. 20.

† δόξα θεοῦ the Glory, or Majesty of God, may very well be put for θεός, or God himself, just as δόξα ἀγγέλων, the Dignity of Angels, is used by Ignatius for Angels themselves : καὶ τὰ ἐπερχόμενα καὶ ἡ δόξα τῶν ἀγγέλων, καὶ οἱ ἄρχοντες οὐρανοῦ τε, καὶ ἀόρατοι, εἰ μὴ πιστεύσωσιν εἰς τὸ αἶμα χριστοῦ κακένοις καὶ οἰς ἑσται. And to Exod. xxxiii. 13. where some Copies have it, ἐμφάνισόν μοι σεαυτὸν, others read, δειξόν μοι σεαυτῶν δόξαν. And thus, St. Paul had just before told us, that Christ was ἐν μορφῇ θεῶ, ἐν μορφῇ δούλου, ἐν ὁμοιωματι ἀνθρώπων : so, keeping still to the same Manner of Expression, he now acquaints us, that He was εἰς δόξαν θεοῦ, e. i. εἰς θεόν, or ἐν θεῷ, in the Unity of God the Father.

THIS

THIS is truly and evidently the *Sense* of *St. Paul*: And what now becomes of this *mighty Objection*, and all the *Noise* that has been made in *Defence* of a *relative and subordinate Worship* to our *Saviour*? Where is there any *Instance* of such a *Worship* paid to *Him*? Or any *Caution* to give *Him* ONLY such. And yet our *Adversaries* are pleas'd to talk as confidently of these Things, as if the *Scripture* was the most *express* in these Points that it possibly could be. Bold Men indeed! To play with *Divinity*, as some (a great deal more pardonably) have done with *Philosophy*, first frame a *false Hypothesis*, and then invent I know not what *imaginary CYCLES* and *EPICYCLES* in order to support it.

LET me therefore have Leave to conclude, That, as *Christ* was worshipped by the first and earliest *Christians*; so the *Scripture* no where tells us, that he was *invoked* by them, or is to be so by us, in an *inferior and secondary* manner. And to make this Matter (if possible) still clearer, I say farther, That *Christ* COULD NOT be *invoked* in such a Manner. I say, COULD NOT. And this, I think, is plain from the FIRST COMMANDMENT, and the REASON on which it is founded.

As to the *Command* it self, 'tis plain and intelligible to the meanest Capacity, *Thou shalt have*, that is, thou shalt worship No

OTHER GODS but ME. *i. e.* None besides the great JEHOVAH; none of any Sort, either as *Superior, Equal, or Inferior*; either as *Primary, or Secondary*; either as *Dependent on Him, or Independent*; either as *HIS Representatives, or otherwise*. This is the easy and natural, and obvious *Sense* of the *Command*; nay indeed, the *ONLY* Sense that it is any way *capable* of. And so long as *this Rule* holds, so long a *secondary, or inferior* Sort of *Worship* is the greatest Absurdity.

BUT that *this Rule* will and must for ever hold, (setting aside all other Considerations, and particularly this weighty One, that it has never been *contradicted* by any *succeeding Revelation*) is evident from the *REASON*, on which it is founded. *Thou shalt have no other Gods but Me. Why so? Because I the Lord thy God am a Jealous God*; and therefore can never bear any *BEING* besides my self shall have the very least Share of *religious Worship* with me. That this *REASON* belongs to the 1st, as well as the 2^d *Commandment*, is what none can deny: And if any one doubts it, he may easily satisfy himself from the 14th v. of the 34th Chapter of *Exodus*, where the same *Command*, is again repeated in the following Words: *Thou shalt have no other God: For the Lord, whose Name is Jealous, is a Jealous God.*

THE *Command* then is founded in God's *Jealousy* ; and therefore must be of the same *Continuance* with it. But God's *Jealousy* (like all his other *Attributes*) can have no *End* or *Limitation* : The *divine Nature* is not capable of any *Change* or *Alteration* : There is not with the *Father of Lights* any *Variable-ness*, or *Shadow* of turning. And therefore from this, and what has gone immediately before, we may draw the following *Con-clusions* :

1st, THAT all religious *Worship* is com-
manded to the SUPREME God, and ON-
LY : Consequently, in the

2^d Place, THAT all religious *Worship* to
ANY OTHER God is prohibited by the same
Command.

3^{dly}, THAT this *Prohibition* is founded
in God's *Nature*, his being a JEALOUS
GOD ; and therefore

4^{thly}, THAT this *Prohibition* is of eternal
Obligation, because God's *Nature* cannot
Alter :

5^{thly}, THAT, in Consequence of this,
this *Prohibition* could not be *Altered* under
the *Gospel* :

6^{thly},

6thly, THAT, for this Reason, Christ could not be subordinately worshipped under the Gospel; and therefore,

7thly, THAT, since He was worshipped under the Gospel, by being *pray'd to*, and *called upon*, it must be in a *Supreme*, and *absolute Manner*; from whence (by *Propos. 1st.*) it follows,

8thly, THAT Christ was God Supreme, since no other Being COULD BE so Worshipped.

All that I have here laid down is no more than what may fairly be deduced from what St. Paul says to the Galatians, c. 4. 8. *When ye knew not God, ye did Service to them, which are not by nature Gods.* Where the Apostle represents it as an *Absurdity*, arising from their *Ignorance* of the *divine Nature*, to *Worship* any *Being*, that is not so, are not the *Arians* then *Guilty* of this *Absurdity*, in paying him a *divine and religious Worship*? To avoid this Dr. Clarke has recourse to two Solutions: The 1st is, that are not Gods by *Nature*, are mere *Fictions*, and have no *Being* at all in *Nature*. But this Explanation he is forc'd to give up to Mr. Nel-

Nelson's † Friend, who has obliged him to own that the *Words* will not naturally bear it. The 2d is, That they are such, as in the Reason, and Nature, and Truth of things, have not that Authority and Dominion, which is vainly ascribed to them: Whereas Christ is invested with a true divine Power and Authority, and therefore may justly be made the Object of Worship, which the other could not. But let the Dr. tell us, where he meets with φύσει in this Sense? For at present, let me say, he has only produced Three Instances, the first of which is nothing to the purpose; and the other Two are directly against him. Do BY NATURE, i. e. by the Light of Nature, the things contained in the Law. Rom. ii. 14. What is this to the purpose? Jews by Nature, i. e. originally and by Descent. Gal. ii. 15. By Nature, i. e. by Birth, the Children of Wrath, τέκνα φύσει ὀργῆς, just as Plato in Gorg. ἔ φύσει οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ἀγαθοὶ γίγνοντο, Good Men are not Born Good, or are not so by Nature. This indeed is the only natural and proper Sense of the Word, and therefore such as it should always have where the Context will admit of it. φύσει, says the Scholiast in Soph.

† Rep. to Mr. Nelson, p. 77.

Ajac. ἐπὶ γένος λέγεται κυριως, and is *opposed* to θέσει, just as υἱὸς φύσει is set in *Opposition* to Him that is only so by θέσει; and so μὴ φύσει θεός, must necessarily be understood of those that are no more than *made Gods*, or θεοποιούμενοι. The Gods therefore, which the Galatians are *blamed* for *worshipping*, were those that had not an *original and inherent divine Nature*; and except our B. Saviour has it, we too must lie under the same *Condemnation*. To *worship* any Thing that is not *naturally and essentially God*, is declared by St. Paul to be *Idolatry*: But St. Paul has positively told us that *Christ* is to be *worshipped*; and therefore, according to St. Paul, He must be *naturally and essentially GOD*.

To Summ up all that has been said under this *Article*; 'tis plain, that as the SON, whose *Name* we are *baptised into*, was really MAN; so was He really GOD, God in the highest *Sense*: And this, in the 1st place, *From his own Declaration*; 2dly, *From the Attestation of the divine Spirit by the Mouth of the Apostles*; and Lastly, *From the religious Worship which was given Him by the First Christians, in CALLING UPON HIS NAME*.

I come now in the next Place to inquire what is meant by the *Holy Ghost*. And in this, I shall be as *Brief* as may be.

First,

First then, it plainly appears, that the Holy Ghost is represented to us in Scripture, as a Person, and such things said of it, as can only be applied to a Person properly so called. Thus St. Paul speaks of the * Mind, the Sense, or Desire of the Spirit: an Expression highly improper for any thing but a Person! And thus Christ tells his Disciples, When † HE [ἐν ἐμοί, that Person] the Spirit of Truth is come, HE will guide you into all Truth: For HE will not speak of HIMSELF; but whatsoever HE shall hear, that shall he speak, and HE will shew you Things to come. HE will Glorify Me: For HE will receive of Mine, and shew it unto you. Does not every Sentence, and almost every Syllable, carry in it the strongest Evidence of personal Properties and Affections? And if this is too little, what shall we think of those Expressions of our Saviour's, wherein he speaks § of Blasphemy, and Sin against the Holy Ghost? All manner of Sin, (says he) and [particularly] Blasphemy shall be forgiven unto Men: But the Blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto Men.

* φρόνημα τῷ πνεύματι. Rom. viii. 27.

† Joh. xvi. 13, 14. See Scrip. Doct. p. 179.

§ Matth. xii. 31.

ADD to this, that in this very Passage, the Holy Ghost is Personally opposed to Beelzebub, as a good Spirit to an evil one. If I (says our Saviour) by Beelzebub cast out Devils; by whom do your Children cast them out? But if I cast out Devils by the Spirit of God; then the Kingdom of God is come unto you. But

2dly, As the Holy Ghost is strictly and properly a Person; so is He a Divine Person too, or (to speak more clearly) really, and truly GOD, Thus St. Paul * tells us, that in the Church of Christ different Abilities were bestow'd on different Persons, according as it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, who divided them to every one severally as He would; making Him, by this, what none but GOD can be, the independent Principle, Author, and Disposer of all spiritual Gifts and Graces. Thus the same Apostle indifferently styles the Corinthians, the † Temples of God, and of the Holy Ghost, speaking of these two as one and the same: Just as St. Peter puts no Distinction between lying § to the Holy Ghost, and to God. The same Truth may be inferr'd from his being stiled the eternal

* 1 Corinth. xii. 11.

† 1 Corinth. iii. 16. collat. cum c. 6. 19.

§ Act. v. 3, 4.

Spirit ; from *Christ's* being called * *the Son of God*, because He was begotten by the *Holy Ghost* ; and, above all, from the *Form of Baptism*, by which we are as much dedicated to the *Holy Ghost*, as to the *Father* himself.

THUS is the *Son GOD*, and the *Holy Ghost GOD* ; Both of them *GOD* in the same Sense that the *Father* is. And from hence appears the great Mistake of *Dr. Clarke* and others, in asserting that the Term, *FATHER*, is always in *Scripture* put absolutely for the one *God*. That it *SOMETIMES* is to be understood so, is very certain ; and yet that it oftentimes, and particularly in the *Form of Baptism*, is used only to denote ONE of the *THREE PERSONS* in the *GOD-HEAD*, is what, I think, an ingenuous Mind cannot help assenting to. There is *GOD*, the *Father*, and yet there is *GOD*, the *Λόγος* or the *Son* ; and notwithstanding this, the *Holy Ghost* is as much *GOD* as Either of the Former.

BUT if this be true, will some say ; if the *Scripture* really tells us, that the *Father* is *GOD* ; the *Son*, *GOD* ; and the *Holy Ghost*, *GOD*, must it not follow from hence, that

* Heb. ix. 14 *Dr. Clarke* observes, that in some Copies, it is the *Holy Spirit*. But what says *Mills*? αὐτῶς, Interpretamentum, ut videtur, de margine libri alicujus in contextum adscitum.

(according to the *Scripture*) we must believe there are *Three GODS*?

THIS is the common *Objection* in this Case; and such a one, as naturally suggests an *Answer* to it self: It only helps us to recollect, that the *same Scripture* which asserts the *THREE* preceeding *PERSONS* each of them to be *GOD*, does likewise assert that there is but *one GOD*; which *different Assertions* can only be reconciled by this, *THAT*, tho' this *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost* are each of them, separately consider'd, *one intelligent Agent*, or *Person*; yet still they are *ALL* of them *united*, in such a manner, under *one common Substance*, as to make but *one*, and the self same *BEING*.

AND where, I pray, is the *Absurdity* of all this? To say, that we cannot conceive it, is only to confess that we are ignorant, and therefore ought to be modest. And this makes it a very edifying *Doctrine*; since it teaches every one a *Truth*, that scarce any one cares to have applied to himself. But if the *Want* of conceiving a Thing, is an Argument against the *Truth* of it; then must even *Mathematical Demonstrations* themselves fall to the Ground. For tell one who is a *Stranger* to *Algebra*, that a *negative Quantity* multiplied into a *negative Quantity*, will produce an *affirmative*: Or one who knows little or nothing of *Geometry*, that there is a *certain Figure*, in which two right *Lines* may

approach *infinitely* nearer and nearer to the
two Sides of a *Curve*, without so much as a
Possibility of ever *touching* them; and you
 shall as soon teach them the *Arts* themselves,
 as make them *conceive* these *certain*, and
demonstrative TRUTHS. And where is the
 Difference between *their Ignorance*, and *ours*?
 They cannot *conceive* these Things, as not
 being *acquainted* with those *Rules*, and *Prin-*
ciples, on which the *Knowledge* of them de-
pends: Nor *we* what is *revealed* to us of
 GOD, as having but *short*, and *imperfect*
Views of the *divine Nature*. But shall they,
 or *we*, stand out against these *natural*, or *spi-*
ritual TRUTHS, merely because they are
 above the *Reach* of our *Conception*? Shall we
 either of us, for that Reason, positively *deny*
 them, and make both *them*, and their *As-*
sertors, the *Subjects* of our *Mirth* and *Diver-*
sion? This indeed may gain us the *Cha-*
*ra*cter of *obstinate Fools*, but never of *wise*
 and *judicious Men*. Reason (if we attended
 to it) would teach us a very different *Les-*
son; would bid us reflect on our own *Ign-*
orance and *Weakness*, and in *things* that
 we cannot *comprehend*, always to *proportion*
 our *Belief* of them to that *Degree* of *Autho-*
rity they come recommended to us with;
 where *this* is *small*, to let our *Faith* be so too;
 where *great*, to let it *rise* accordingly. Were
 this *Method* made use of in our *Reasonings*
 about

about the *Trinity*, we should hear no more of the *Difficulties* that attend *that Doctrine*.

Let *those* be never so great, they are only the *Effects* of our own *Ignorance*. But for the *Doctrine* it self, it proceeds from an *Authority*, which I dare depend upon: An *Authority*! the most secure that possibly can be; no less than *that* of *G O D* himself, who as *He* is infinitely *Wise*, cannot be deceived himself, and as *He* is infinitely *Good*, will not deceive me. 'Tis thus that *Reason* assists *Revelation*: The more freely I think, the more simply I believe; and the more impartial I am, the more I embrace the *Doctrine* of the *Trinity*.

Now to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Three Persons, and one God, be ascribed all Honour and Glory, from this Time forth, for vermore. Amen.





APPENDIX.



Having mentioned in my *Preface* the *contested Verse* in the *1st Epistle of St. John*, and perhaps spoken of it in such a Way, as to give to some *weak Minds* an *Occasion* of *stumbling*; I think it proper to give my Thoughts of it here in Manner following.

First, I observe, That tho' the *7th Verse* should really be *supposititious*, yet it is the Opinion of some very learned Men, that the *Doctrine* it teaches, is certainly contained in the *8th*.

A very dear and intimate Friend of mine (who at present must be *nameless*) very strenuously contends, that by the *Spirit*, the *Water*, and the *Blood*, can be meant nothing less than the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*; and that for this Reason, because the Three former are described, not as *Things* in the *neuter Gender*, but as *Persons* in the *masculine* are not call'd *τετα*, as *Faith*, *Hope*,
and

and Charity are by St. Paul, but *τρεῖς*, and *οἱ τρεῖς*. And then for the Words *εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσι*, (supposing this to be the true Reading) He will not have them to signify, *They agree in one*, as if nothing more was meant than an Unity of Testimony, but rather, *They are One*, and so denote an *Unity of Essence*. Thus, says he, *δύο εἰς σάρκα μίαν*, Matth. xix. 5. is explain'd by our Savior in the next Verse, *δύο σάρξ μία*. To which he adds, that this Translation of his is favour'd by all the *Latin Versions*, which constantly render it by *Unum*, without any Regard to the *Præposition*. These are his Thoughts of this Passage: And indeed he defends himself with much seeming Force of Reason, and Strength of Argument, that, if *Matter of Fact* did not stand in his Way, he could not be easily resisted.

Secondly, I observe, that whatever be the Fate of this Verse, it must be granted, that the Doctrine contain'd in it, was receiv'd and asserted in the most early Ages of Christianity. When Tertullian says of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, that these Three * are One, and expressly declares, that this is meant of an Unity of Substance; and when St. Cyprian

* *Qui tres unum sunt. l. contr. Prax. c. 25.*

tells *Jubajanus*, that *Three are One*, meaning the *B. Persons* in the *Trinity*: Whether these *Words* are their *own*, or *St. John's*, this, I think, is the least that can be deduced from them, that these venerable *Fathers*, who liv'd so near to the *Age* of the *Apostles*, did maintain a *Trinity in Unity*, or, *Three Divine Persons* in one and the same *Substance*. And even *this* to a Man of Thought and Reflection is doubtless a *Point* of considerable *Moment*. And then

AGAIN *Thirdly*, for *St. Cyprian*; tho' his *Words* that are found in his *Book of the Unity of the Church*, should be allow'd to be taken from the *8th Verse*; yet who can believe, that he should say with such *Assurance*, as he does, that it was WRITTEN * of the *Father, Son, and Holy Ghost*; and these *Three are One*; except at that time it was the *general and received Sense* of the *Church*, that by the *Spirit, the Water, and the Blood*, were signified the *B. Persons* of the *Trinity*? Every one knows (who knows him) that he was not an *Author* who affected *mystical Expositions* of the *Scripture*; and supposing that contrary to

* *De Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto* SCRIPTUM est, Et hi Tres Unum sunt. lib. de Unit. Eccles.

his *Temper*, he had given us *one* here, yet it cannot be *supposed* but that he would have done it with greater *Modesty*: He would never have given a *Scriptum est* to his *own private Fancy*, and asserted *that* to be in the *Word of God*, which no Body could have found but *himself*.

THE *Arians* and *Socinians* would do well to consider these Things, tho' they are never so *confident*, that the 7th *Verse* was not written by *St. John*.

BUT give me leave to tell *them*, that they have no Reason to be so *confident* of this, as in their Writings they appear to be. The *Want* of the 7th *Verse* in the most ancient *Greek MSS.* that yet are come to *Light*, is no certain *Proof* that it is *spurious*, when at the same Time there seem to be sufficient *Witnesses* on the other Side to attest its *Divine Authority*.

The *FIRST* of these I shall produce is *St. Cyprian*, who in a *Passage* I have already cited, positively tells us, that *of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, it is written!* and these Three are One. And where is it thus written, but in the *celebrated Verse* we are now defending. There is no *other Place* that speaks expressly so of *these Three*; and therefore it must be *this* which *St. Cyprian* refers to.

WELL!

WELL! But Dr. Clarke and Mr. Emlyn are exceeding *positive*, that *these Words* of St. Cyprian are only a *mystical Exposition* of the 8th Verse, where the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, are taken by that *Writer* for the *Father*, the *Son*, and the *Holy Ghost*: “*And of this*, * says Dr. Clarke, *we have a clear Account given us by Facundus.*”

BUT (not to swell this *Appendix* with needless Citations) what clear Account, I would know, could *Facundus* give of this Matter, who liv'd at no less a Distance from St. Cyprian than of *three whole Centuries*? How could he know any more than Dr. Clarke himself does, that St. Cyprian expounded the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost? St. Cyprian does not say so himself: And where then had *Facundus* his Intelligence? To be plain; the clear Account that he gives, is no more than a bare Conjecture. *Facundus*, it seems, had got a Copy that wanted the 7th Verse; and for this Reason he supposes that St. Cyprian's did so too; and therefore concludes, that his Words are taken from the 8th Verse. This is the clear Account that *Facundus* gives; the best you may be sure, that could be found out;

* Rep. to Mr. Nelson, p. 211.

and yet let me say, there is no Person free from Prejudice, but who will expect a great deal better.

BUT farther: If *Facundus* has any Force on one Side; may not *Fulgentius* have Leave to be heard on the other? He is a Person of as good Credit as the former; and of somewhat better Authority as being near 40 Years before him? And he very plainly tells us, that the Words of St. Cyprian are taken from the 7th Verse The *blessed Apostle St. John, says he, testifies, saying, There are Three, which bear Witness in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One. Which [Testimony of St. John] is acknowledg'd by the B. Martyr St. Cyprian, in his Epistle of the Unity of the Church, who says—Concerning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, it is written, And three are one.

HERE Mr. Emlyn would fain play the Critic, if he could. *Fulgentius*, says † he,

* *B. Joannes Apostolus testatur, dicens: Tres sunt qui testimonium perhibent in cœlo, Pater, Verbum, & Spiritus Sanctus; & tres unum sunt. Quod etiam (Joannis scil. testimonium) beatissimus Martyr Cyprianus in Epistola de Unitate Ecclesie confitetur, dicens—De Patre, Filio, & Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, Et hi Tres unum sunt. Fulgent. Afric. Resp. con. Arianos.*

† Inquiry into 1 Jo. 5. 7. p. 336. inter Miscel.

speaks

speaks of it as a remarkable Confession in St. Cyprian, Quod etiam B. Cyprianus confitetur, which also St. Cyprian confesses. Confesses what? That St. John had those Words, The Father, Word, and Spirit, and these three are one? Was that such an Acknowledgment, if he found it in his Epistle? No, but he acknowledg'd the Father, Son, and Spirit to be One, out of St. John, by a mystical Interpretation of the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood, which are one. This indeed was somewhat far-fetch'd, and not so clear a Point, but St. Cyprian's confessing it might give it some Credit; but it could give none to an undoubted Text of St. John, to say, Cyprian acknowledg'd it to be true.

THIS is his learned Criticism, which is so far from carrying a Sting in its Tail, that if it makes any Wound at first. it cures it entirely afterwards. St. Cyprian's Confession, says our sagacious Writer, could give no Credit to an undoubted Text of St. John. Right! But might it not to a doubted one? And is it not produced for that very Purpose? Fulgentius first appeals to, and then vindicates the Authority of the disputed Text; which Text, he was very well aware, was omitted in a great many Copies, and by several of the Fathers. But, says he, it was own'd by St. Cyprian. How own'd? Why, plainly cited by him: For that is all the Owning and Confession that St. Cyprian makes, or Fulgentius

gentius intends; and a great deal more than Mr. *Emlyn* cares for.

THERE is therefore no good Reason to imagine, that the Words of St. *Cyprian* do not belong to the 7th *Verse*. And what if it should be still farther added, that *they* could not be taken from the 8th? If they were not there *originally*, 'tis plain they could not: And that they were not *originally* there, is an *Opinion* that does not seem to want a *Foundation*.

FOR IST, 'Tis a thing very well known, that the Words, *Et tres unum sunt*, in the 8th *Verse*, are wanting in most of the anti-ent *Latin MSS.* In *plurimis MSS. libris desiderantur*, says Dr. *Mills* in *Append.* And tho' F. *Simon* says in one Place, that there is no Contest about them; yet in another * he owns they are not written in some *MSS.* of the *French King's Library*. *Aquinas* very positively says, that they are † not to be found in the *true Exemplars*, and the learned *Mills* has nothing to lay against it, but that *Aquinas* had not seen the *Greek ones*. From hence indeed one would imagine, that οἱ τρεῖς εἰς ἓν ἐσσι, were in all the *Greek MSS.* But neither in the

* Crit. Hist. N. T. Part. 2. p. 89.

† In veris Exemplaribus non habetur, &c.

2d Place, is this to be granted: The *Complutensian Edition*, 'tis well known, has rejected them, and it cannot be said here, that the *Editors* went solely upon the Authority of *Aquinas*: Not to mention the *Codex Britannicus*, we are told by *Grotius* of * a most antient MS. as he calls it, whose Authority he generally depended upon, that read no more than τρεῖς εἰσι οἱ μαρτυροῦντες, τὸ πνεῦμα, καὶ τὸ υἱὸν, καὶ τὸ αἷμα. This he believes to be the true Reading, but at the same time intimates, that the whole 7th Verse is *supposititious*. But if so, then *tres unum sunt*, is not to be read at all; and what then becomes of St. Cyprian's SCRIPTUM EST? 'Tis evident it was somewhere WRITTEN so; and if not in the 8th Verse, we have no Reason to doubt but it was in the 7th.

To sum up what has been said of the Evidence of this Father: As he plainly asserts, that it is written of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, And these Three are One; so it does not appear, that what he says, is only a mystical Exposition of the 8th Verse. He does not say so himself; and 'tis nothing but *Presumption* in others to say it for him, who know nothing of the Matter. Add to this, that according to several very antient

* Vide *Grot.* in loc.

MSS. the Words, *Et tres unum sunt*, were not originally in the 8th Verse; and therefore could not possibly be taken from it. From all which it follows, that what we now count the 7th Verse is the Passage quoted by St. Cyprian, and therefore is, and must be GENUINE.

To this Testimony of St. Cyprian let us now in the

2d Place, add that of Tertullian, who liv'd some time before him. And what does he say? Why, says he, * the Connexion of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Holy Ghost, makes three coherent Persons; which Three are One——just as 'tis said, I and my Father are One. Dr. Clarke † is pleas'd to tell us, that the Words, *Three are One*, are plainly not St. John's, but Tertullian's. But why so plainly? Are not there such Words in the Writings of St. John? And when we find them in Tertullian exactly as they are quoted from St. John by all the Latin Fathers, is it not abundantly more probable, that they are the Words of Scripture than his own? Did not the Words relate to a Point

* —*Connexus Patris in Filio, & Filii in Paraclito, tres efficit coherentes, alterum ex altero. Qui tres unum sunt—quomodo dictum est, Ego & Pater unum sumus. cont. Prax. c. 25.*

† *Scrip. Doct. p. 206.*

of *Polemical Divinity*, there is scarce a Man living but would own it. And shall an *evident Truth* become *evidently the contrary*, merely to support an *Hypothesis*? I am fully perswaded that Mr. *Emlyn* did not think what Dr. *Clarke* says to be so plain, or he would never have *disjointed* the *Sentence*, as he has done. As for *Tertullian*, says * this Writer, *speaking of the Father, Son, and Spirit, he had only said*, These Three are One; AND 'tis written, the Father and I are One. For my Part, I never knew before, that *quomodo* signified *and*. But a few Pages before he translated it *right*: And what mov'd him here to do it *otherwise*? He sets down the *and* indeed in a *different Character* from the rest, as if he design'd to *distinguish* it for his own; and so truly it is. But let him show, if he can, why he did not keep *closer* to his *Author*. Let *Tertullian* but speak like himself, and the Question will presently be decided. *Three are One*,—just as 'tis said, *I and my Father are One*. One of these Expressions is purposely brought to *illustrate* the other: Both of them are met with in *Scripture*. Is not one of them *Divine* as well as the other? No. Why? *Because it is not*. An admirable Reason! In the mean time, I would have it

* *Inquir. into 1 Joh. 5. 7. p. 332.*

consider'd, that tho' it was necessary for the *Fathers*, to compare the *Scripture-Phrases* with each other; yet it was not their way to make *Choice* of such *Expressions* of their own, as must needs be *expounded* by those of the *inspired Writers*.

WELL then! The Words *Three are One*, are not *Tertullian's* but *St. John's*. But still, I warrant, he took them from the 8th *Verse*, and understood the *Spirit*, the *Water*, and the *Blood*, of the *Father*, *Son*, and *Holy Ghost*: To which I answer, that if he did so, it confirms what I observed above, that this *mystical Interpretation* was generally received by the *Church*, and therefore ought in all Reason to be admitted by us. But after all, it seems probable, as I mention'd before, that, in *Tertullian's* Time, the Words were not in the 8th *Verse*, but the 7th; and therefore we may conclude, that it is the 7th *Verse* he had an Eye to.

3. THE next Evidence, and that a very strong one, is taken from that *Profession of Faith*, which *Victor of Vite* tells * us was in the Year of our Lord 484, presented to *Huneric*, King of the *Vandals*; by *Eugenius*, and other *Bishops*, in the Name of the whole *Church of Africa*. That the *Holy Ghost* has

* lib. 3 de *Persec. Vandal.*

the same Divinity with the Father and the Son—is prov'd by the Testimony of St. John; for he says, There are Three which bear Testimony in Heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost, and these Three are One. This Account of Victor's Mr. Emlyn takes a great deal of Pains to *invalidate*. In the first Place * he would fain give him the Lie; but there his *Courage* fails him. A little after, this *public Confession* must only have been some *private Composure*, tho' in the Name of the other Bishops, who were now scatter'd and banish'd. A very likely Story! and that much becomes a *Man*, who in the very Page before is a profess'd Enemy to *smooth Suppositions*; tho' indeed this is not properly one of those, but on the contrary, as rough a one as ever was made. Let him *guess* once again, and perhaps he may be something more *happy*. In the mean time, let Victor's Relation be suffer'd to stand good. There was a *Confession*, a *public Confession*, made and offer'd exactly as he tells us. In this *Confession* an Appeal was made to the 7th Verse of St. John. And if St. John had no such Words, why then did not the *Arians*, who were then in the highest Degree of Favour with *Hunmeric*; why, if they were able, did

* *Inquir. into* 1 Joh. 5. 7. p. 325. in *Miscel.*

not they show the Forgery? Why did not they make it out, that it was a *spurious Passage*, and had only *then*, or *an Age*, or *two* before been added to the *Text* of the *Evangelist*? This they did not attempt to do; and when Mr. *Emlyn* is pleas'd to give a *Reason* why they did not, we shall easily account for its *not being cited* by *St. Austin* and *Cerealis*. As to *Eucherius*, whom he reckons amongst *those*, who, he says, *did not know* of this *Text*, 'tis certainly a Mistake, since we find it expressly mention'd by him, *lib. formul. spirit. intell. c. II. §. 3, 4*. I must not omit here, that *Vigilius Taplensis*, who was one of the *Subscribers* to the *abovesaid Profession*, appeals more than *once* to these *Words* of *St. John*; and though he differs from us in his *Reading* of the *8th Verse*, yet he perfectly agrees with us in that of the *7th*.

THE 4th and last *Witness* I shall produce is *One* who has never appear'd in this *Controversy* before, and whose *Evidence* should by no means be slighted. The *Author* I here intend, is *Cassiodorus*, or *Cassiodorius*, whose *Commentaries*, or *Completions*, on the *Epistles*, the *Acts* of the *Apostles*, and the *Revelations*, supposed to be intirely lost, are lately recover'd, being found at *Verona* by the *Marquis Scipio Masserius*, and this very last Year printed at *Florence*, by his *Care* and *Diligence*. No Body, who sees it, can either
doubt

doubt of the *Genuineness* of the *Work*, or the *Fidelity* of the *Publisher*. *Cassiodorius*, as *Dupin* tells us in his *Ecclesiastical History*, was born about the *Year* 470, and at 70 Years of Age retiring from the *Court*, wherein he had been advanc'd to the greatest Dignities, the Honour of *Consulship* it self not excepted, he betook himself to a *Monastic Life*, and the closest *Study of Divinity*. He was eminent for a *curious* and *critical Genius* which led him to a Choice of the most accurate and *antient Exemplars*. These he applied himself to *collate* and *correct*, and wrote a *Dissertation* upon *Orthography*, which he tells us, he *undertook*, in order to have the Books of *Scripture* *purely* and *correctly* written.

SUCH was *Cassiodorius*. And from this *Character* of him, we have the greatest Reason to believe, that he would not in his *Commentaries* insist upon any pretended Passage of *Scripture*, that upon the *nicest Inquiry* he did not find to be plainly *Genuine*. And yet this very *Cassiodorius* is the *Man*, who *shews* by his *Commentary*, that he certainly read all the 7th and Part of the 8th *Verse*.

* *Testificantur in terrâ tria Myſteria, Aqua, Sanguis, & Spiritus; quæ in Paſſione Domini leguntur impleta: In Cælo autem Pater, & Filius, and Spiritus Sanctus; & hi Tres unus eſt Deus.* Complex. p. 125.

There

There are, says he, three Misteries, which bear Witness on Earth, the Water, the Blood, and the Spirit; which we read to have been completed at our Lord's Passion: But in Heaven, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost; and these Three are One God.*

And what have the *Arians* to say to this? Is this a *forged Piece* of *Cassiodorius*? No. Did he read it only in some *corrupted Copies* of his *own Age*. The *Character* of the *Man* will not let us *suspect* this. How pressing† is he with those of his *Monastery* to make use of the very best *M. S.* and such as had been carefully *collated* with, and *corrected* by the *Greek Text*; nay not only so, but that, in all doubtful Places, they should be govern'd by the Authority of *two* or *three* *anti-*ent Copies. And can we then think, that *He* who requir'd such *exactness* in others should be guilty of the greatest *negligence* himself? Nothing can be more improbable. And therefore, for modesty's Sake, let us never hear more of this *Verse*, being *intruded* into the *Version* of *St. Jerom.* 'Tis evident from innumerable Places of these *Commentaries*, that *St. Jerom's* was not the *Translation* he made Use of, but *one* a great deal *older*; and yet it no less evidently appears, that this Passage was found in it.

† In *Divin. Lect.*

CASSIODORIUS then, 'tis plain, did read the 7th Verse; read it in the most correct and antient M. S. And what M. S. in his Days could be accounted antient, that did not come near to the Age of the Apostles?

BUT still, may not we ask one Question? May we not enquire whether *this Commentary*, we have mention'd, be Cassiodorus his own, or only a Translation made by him from another? Certain it is, that Clement Alexandrinus not only wrote a Commentary * on the 1st Epistle of St John; but wrote it too in the same Manner † that is observed by Cassiodore; no less certain, that this Commentary was Translated § by Cassiodore; and, last of all, exceeding Probable, that no such Piece ¶ was wrote originally by Cassio-

* Vide Cassiod. Instit. c. 8. Photij. Bibliothec. 190. Euseb. Eccles. Hist. l. 6. c. 13.

† κεφαλαιωδῶς, says Photius in Biblioth. ἐπι-
λεημεμένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις, says Eusebius.

§ So he tells us himself Instit. c. 8.

¶ The learned Dupin seems to be of Opinion, that Cassiodore's Complexions (those excepted on the Acts, and Revelations) went no farther than the Epistles of St. Paul. He wrote (says he) Commentaries upon the Epistles of St. Paul, the Acts of the Apostles, and the Revelation: From whence the Inference

Cassiodore himself, he having no *Occasion* for it, as being already *supplied* * from the *Version* † of *St. Clement*. At present therefore I am entirely of Opinion, that the *Commentary* on the 1st *Epistle* of *St. John*, which *Cassiodorius* has given us amongst his *Complexions*, is not strictly his own, but *St. Clement's*. *St. Clement* therefore read the 7th *Verse*, and — hold there, says an Adversary: “ For

rence must be, that what we have under his Name upon the other Epistles, is not really Cassiodorius his own. But this, I think, is going too far. For at this Rate, How could Cassiodore tell us (in his Preface to Orthography) of his Complexions in Epistolas Apostolorum, if he only wrote upon those of St. Paul? The Truth of the whole matter seems to be, that as St. Clement gave a short and summary View of all the Canonical Epistles; so Cassiodore Translated four of them, I mean the 1st of St. Peter, the 1st and, 2d of St. John, and that of St. James; and for the rest the Completions in them were mostly, if not intirely his own.

* *It was Cassiodore's way to Borrow what was to his Purpose from other Writers, as may be seen in his Commentaries on the Psalms, where he has taken a great many things from St. Austin, and other Fathers.*

† *The Adumbrations ascribed to St. Clement in the 3d Vol. of the Bibliotheca Patrum, is a spurious Piece, and not the same which was translated by Cassiodore See Dr. Cave's Historia Literaria, p. 56.*

“ what

“ what tho’ the *Complexions* in the 1st *Epi-*
 “ *stle* of St. John are the *Commentaries* of St.
 “ *Clement* translated by *Cassiodore*; yet how
 “ comes this to be a *Proof*, that St. *Clement*
 “ read the 7th *Verse*? Both *Photius*, and
 “ *Cassiodore* confess that *this Work* of St.
 “ *Clement*’s had a great many *Errors* in it;
 “ and the *latter* of *these* expressly tells us,
 “ that to make the *Doctrine* more pure, he has
 “ not in his *Version* kept every where close
 “ to the *Original*. And how then do we
 “ know, but the *Comment* on the 7th *Verse*
 “ is of *Cassiodore*’s putting in”. To which I
 answer, That there is no room for this *Sus-*
 picion, since whatever *Alterations* were made
 by *Cassiodore*, we hear not a *Syllable* of any
Additions. He tells us of some * *Offen-*
dicula in St. *Clement*, which he had taken
 care to *exclude*; but for any Sort of *Supple-*
ment, there is not a *Word* of it. ’Tis only
 a forc’d and groundless *Surmise*; and if it
 was otherwise, could be of no *Service* to
 those who raise it. It tends only to insinu-
 ate, that St. *Clement*’s Omission in this place,
 was one of those *Faults*, which *Cassiodore*
 saw it necessary to correct; and this plainly in-
 fers, that he had the strongest *Evidence* of
 the 7th *Verse* being *Genuine*. But after all,
 there is no *Occasion* to say this, till the *Sup-*

* § Instit. c. 8.

position, it goes upon, is made more *Probable*. And therefore to *resume* what I was saying above, I must needs repeat it, that *St. Clement*, for any thing that appears to the contrary, did certainly *read* the 7th *Verse*. And if so, we are still got hither ; we come now within the *Bounds* of the *second Century* to one of the most eminent and learned *Fathers*, and him too not a *Latin*, or an *African*, but a *Greek*. *St. Clement* read the 7th *Verse*; and as he lived so near the *Apostolic Age*, and is likewise Remarkable for a wonderful *Fidelity* and *Exactness* in his *Citations*, I am thoroughly persuaded that no *Authority* can be brought so *strong against* this *Text*, as his *Evidence* is for it.

FROM *this*, and the preceding Testimonies, I cannot but conclude, that we have more Reason to *retain* this 7th *Verse* as *Genuine*, than to *reject* it as *spurious*. But let this be as it will, the *Doctrine* contain'd in it, *stands sure*, and is so *grounded* on other *undoubted* Texts of *Scripture*, that the *Gates of Hell* will never be able to prevail against it.

F I N I S.



ERRATA.

PReface, p. 8. l. 3. *r.* endeavouring. p. 5. l. 1. *for*
Nature *r.* Stature. p. 6. l. 2. *after* Paralytic,
add ; p. 20. l. 17. *r.* to follow. p. 27. l. 19. *r.* acquaint.
l. 20. *r.* ἐπιδ'εικνῶς. p. 38. l. 16. *r.* ὅς. p.
48. l. 5. in Notes *for* this *r.* His. p. 57. l. 19. *r.* Apostle.
l. 20. *r.* and so. l. 22. *r.* no scruple. l. 25. *r.* εὐχαριστῶ.
p. 58. l. 20. in Note *for* σεαυτῶ *r.* σεαυτῶ. l. 21.
r. And thus as. p. 60. l. 21. *r.* that any BEING. p.
61. l. 13. *r.* and Him only. p. 62. l. 20. *after* the Words
that is not, *r.* Originally and Essentially God. And if
our Saviour is not so, l. 24. *after* that, *add*, the Gods
which. p. 63. l. 22. *after* Wrath, *add* Ephes. 11. 3,
p. 70. l. 13. *for* simply *r.* firmly. p. 72. l. 16. *r.* such.
p. 78. l. 16. *r.* desiderantur. p. 84. l. 29. *r.* Maffei^{us}.
p. 87. l. 10. *r.* Clemens. p. 90. l. 6. *for* hither *r.* higher.



BOOKS printed for G. Strahan.

THE true Scripture-Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the Eucharist, and the Satisfaction made for us by our Lord *Jesus Christ*, wherein all the Texts of the Old and New Testament, relating thereunto, and the principal Passages in the Liturgy, and Articles of the Church of *England*, are collected, compar'd, explain'd, and vindicated from the Errors of Dr. *Clarke*.

An Enquiry into the ill Designs, Errors, &c. of Dr. *Clarke's* (pretended) Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity; wherein also the wrong Acceptation of some Scripture-Terms, relating to that Doctrine, is attempted to be rectified; and also the Orthodox Doctrine of three Persons in the one and individual Substance of *God*, is made manifest; with a Preface, wherein a late Pamphlet concerning the Difficulties attending the Study of the Scripture in the Way of private Judgment is fully consider'd.

An Enquiry into the manner of Assenting to the Articles and Liturgy of the Church of *England*, practis'd and recommended by Dr. *Clarke*, Rector of St. *James's*, *Westminster*, in his Introduction to his Scripture-Doctrine of the Trinity, in which also is Attempted an Explanation of the Word *Hell* in the Apostles Creed, and the Reasons for inserting the Article of Christ's Descent thither; the 2d Edition; to which is added a Postscript, enquiring whether there is either Common Prayer or Sacraments in his Parish.

Of Spiritual Rule. A Sermon preach'd at the Visitation of the Bishop of *Winton*. By *John Scott*, M. A.

